S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis

H. R. E. Episc. Albae atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PROOEMIUM IN LIBRUM PRIMUM SENTENTIARUM

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp.1-6.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio

Cardinal Bishop of Alba & Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

FOREWORD TO THE FIRST BOOK OF THE SENTENCES

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp.1-6.
Notes by the Quarrachi Editors.

Profunda fluviorum scrutatus est, et abscondita produxit in lucem.
Iob xxviii, 11.

The depths of rivers He has scrutinized, and things hidden away He has brought to light.
Job 28:11

Verbum istud, quod[1] sumtum est ex Iob vigesimo octavo, diligentius consideratum nobis aperuit viam ad praecognoscendum quadruplex genus causae in libro Sententiarum, scilicet *materialis, formalis, efficientis* et *finals*. Causa namque materialis innuitur in nomine *fluviorum*, causa formalis in perscrutatione *profundorum*, causa finalis in revelatione *absconditorum*, causa vero efficiens intelligitur in supposito duorum verborum, scilicet *scutatus est* et *produxit in lucem.*

That word, which[1] is taken from the twenty-eighth chapter of Job, having been considered more diligently by us, opened the way to foreknow the fourfold kinds of cause in the Book of Sentences, namely, the *material, the formal, the efficient,* and *the final*. For the material cause is signified in the name *of rivers*, the formal cause in the investigation of *the depths*, the final cause in the revelation of *hidden things*, but the efficient cause is understood in the addition of two phrases, namely *He has scrutinized* and *He has brought to light.*

Innuitur[2] causa *materialis* nomine *fluviorum* pluraliter, non singulariter, ut non solum tangatur libri totius materia vel subiectum in generali, sed etiam particularum librorum in speciali. Propter quod notandum, quod iuxta *quadruplicem* proprietatem fluvii materialis quadruplex est fluvius spiritualis, de quo secundum quadruplicem differentiam sunt quatuor libri Sententiarum. Considero[3] namque fluvium

The *material* cause is hinted at[2] by the name of *rivers* in the plural, not the singular, to not only touch upon the matter and/or subject of the whole book in general, but even of the smaller parts of the books in detail. On account of which it must be noted, that just as there is a fourfold property of a material river, so there is a fourfold property of a spiritual river, concerning which, according to their

materialem quoad durationem, et invenio *perennitatem.* Nam sicut dicit Isidorus:[4] «Fluvius est perennis fluxus ». Considero quantum ad extensionem, et invenio *spatiositatem.* In hoc enim distinguitur fluvius a rivulo. Considero quantum ad motum, et invenio *circulationem*. Sicut enim dicitur Ecclesiatis primo:[5] *Ad locum, unde exeunt flumina, revertuntur* etc. Considero[6] effectum, et invenio *emundationem.* Nam fluvius propter aquarum abundantiam mundat terras, per quas currit, ita quod non inquinatur.[7] Et quoniam omnes transferentes secundum aliquam similitudinem transferunt,[8] ex hac quadruplici conditione sumta metaphora, quadruplex in spiritualibus fluvius invenitur, sicut colligere possumus ex Scripturis.

fourfold difference, are the four Books of the Sentences. For I consider[3] the material river in regard to its duration, and I find its *perenniality*. For as Isidore says:[4] The river is a perennial flowing. I consider it as much as regards its extension, and I find its *spaciousness*. For in this a river is distinguished from a rivulet. I consider it as much as regards its motion, and I find its *circulation.* For as is said in the first chapter of Ecclesiastes:[5] *To the place, whence streams go forth, they return* etc.. I consider[6] its effect, and I find its *cleansing*. For a river, on account of the abundance of its waters, cleanses the lands, through which it runs, so that it is not polluted.[7] And since every one speaking figuratively [transferentes] according to some similitude, figuratively speaks,[8] according to the metaphor taken from this fourfold condition, a river is found to be fourfold in spiritual things, as we can gather from the Scriptures.

Primo, propter *perennitatem* dicitur fluvius personarum emanatio, quoniam illa emanatio sola est sine principio, sine fine.[9] De hoc fluvio Daniel septimo:[10] *Antiquus dierum sedit, et fluvius igneus rapidusque egrediebatur a facie eius.* Antiquus iste dierum est Pater aeternus, cuius antiquitas est aeternitas. Iste antiquus *sedit,* quia non solum in eo est aeternitas, sed etiam immutabilitas.[11] *A facie illius antiqui egrediebatur fluvius igneus rapidusque,* id est, de sublimitate divinitatis eius procedebat plenitudo *amoris* et plenitudo *virtutis*: plenitudo *virtutis* in Filio,[12] ideo fluvius erat rapidus; plenitudo *amoris* in Spiritu sancto, et ideo fluvius erat igneus.

First, on account of its *perenniality* the emanation of the Persons is called a river, since that emanation alone is without beginning, without end.[9] Concerning this river in the seventh chapter of Daniel:[10] *The Ancient of Days sat, and a fiery and swift river stepped forth from His face.* That Ancient of Days is the eternal Father, whose antiquity is eternity. That Ancient One *sat,* because not only is eternity in Him, but also immutability.[11] *From the face of that Ancient One a fiery and swift river stepped forth,* that is, from the loftiness of His Divinity there proceeded the fullness *of love* and the fullness *of virtue*: the fullness *of virtue* in the Son,[12] for that reason the river was swift; the fullness *of love* in the Holy Spirit, and for that reason the river was fiery.

---

[1] Auctoritate mss. et ed. 1 in hac propositione substituimus constructionem relativam, addendo *quod* et *est*, pro simpliciori participiali, quam habet Vat. Mox ponendo *aperuit* loco *aperit* sequimur praestantiores ex nostris codd. A B C E G K O R S T W X Y ff aliosque, quo specialiter consuluimus.
[2] Vat., refragantibus mss. et ed. 1, addit hic particulam *enim*; cod. Y adiicit *autem*; praeferimus tamen lectionem aliorum codd. et ed. 1, qui quamlibet particulam omittunt.
[3] Plures codd. ut AG I O T V W Y aa bb *Considerando*,

[1] On the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1, we substitute in the proposition the relative construction, adding *which* and *is*, for a simpler participle; which the Vatican edition has. Then by placing *opened* in place of *opens* we follow the more outstanding of our codices A B C E G K O R S T W X Y ff and others which we have especially consulted.
[2] The Vatican edition, with the manuscripts and even edition 1 opposing it, adds this word *for*; codex Y adds to this *moreover*; we prefer however the reading of the other codices and editor 1, who

qui et deinde propter mutatam constructionem post *durationem* omittunt *et*. Idem recurrit in tribus subinde sequentibus propositionibus. Lectio haec, utpote in se elegantior, non displiceret, si sufficienti numero codd. fulciretur, et si praedicti codd. sibi constarent; at in ultima propositione paucissimi codd. pro hac lectione reperiuntur.

[4] Libr. XIII. Etymolog. sive Originum, c. 24: *Fluvius est perennis aquarum decursus, a fluendo perpetim dictus*.

[5] Vers. 7 — Vat. contra mss. et edd. 1 , 2 , 3, 6, modo activo *dicit Ecclesiates*.

[6] Codd. F M X sibi constantes addunt *quantum ad.*

[7] Vat. *inquinantur*, sed falso, uti exp applicatione inferius facta colligitur, et repugnantibus mass. ac ed. 1.

[8] Haec propositio ex VI. Topic Aristotelis c. 2. sumta iisdem verbis exhibetur in ed. operum Aristotelis impressa Venetiis per Gregorium de Gregoriis expensis Benedicti Fontanae, 1496 et in ed. Parisiensi ab Ambrosio Firmin-Didot, 1878; in aliis vero edd. habetur ita: Omnes enim metaphora utentes secundum aliquam similitudinem ea utuntur. — Paulo post, renitentibus mss. et ed. 1, Vat. male omittit *sumta* ; deinde ponit *fluviis* pro *fluvius*.

[9] Cod. Y ultimam propositionis partem sic exhibet: *in quantum ipsa sola est sine principio et sine fine.*

[10] Textus iste partim ex v. 9, partim ex v. 10 sumtus est.

[11] Ed. 1 *incommutabilitas.*

[12] Vat. *Filium* et paulo post *Spiritum sanctum*; sed lectionem in textum receptam, quae est fere omnium mss. et ed. 1, praeferimus tamquam meliorem; ipsi enim termino primae emanationis divinae sive Filio appropriatur *virtus* (infra d. 32. a. 2. q. 2. ad utl.), secundae vero emanationis termino sive Spiritui sancto *amor* (d. 10. a. 2.q. 1.).

however omit the word.

[3] Many codices like A G I O T V W Y aa bb have *By considering*, which also then on account of a changed construction omit *and* after *duration.* Likewise it occurs in the three subsequent propositions here below. This reading, in as much as it could be more elegant in itself, is not displeasing, if it is supported by a sufficient number of codices, and if the aforesaid codices agree with it; but in the last proposition very few codices return to this reading.

[4] Book XIII. of The Etymologies, or Of Origins, chapter 21: "A river is a perennial down-flowing of waters, called such by its perpetual flowing".

[5] Verse 7 -- The Vatican edition, against manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3, 6, in the now active voice has *Ecclesiastes says.*

[6] Codices F M X, agreeing with themselves, add *as much as regards*.

[7] The Vatican edition has *they are polluted,* but wrongly, as is gathered from having made a comparison with what follows, and with the opposing manuscripts and edition 1.

[8] This proposition, taken from the sixth book of Aristotle's Topic, chapter 2, is quoted in the same words in the edition of Aristotle's works printed at Venice by Gregorius de Gregoriis at the expense of Benedict Fontana, 1496, and in the Parisian edition by Ambrosius Firmin-Didot, 1878; in other editions it is rendered thus: "For all using a metaphor use it according to some similitude". -- a little after, in the opposing manuscripts and edition 1, the Vatican edition badly omits *taken*, then places *in rivers* for *river*.

[9] Codex Y exhibits the last part of the sentence thus: *in as much as it alone is without beginning and without end.*

[10] This text is taken partly from v. 9, partly from v. 10.

[11] Edition 1 has *incommutability*.

[12] The Vatican edition *the Son* and a little after *the Holy Spirit*; but we prefer, as the better reading, the one received in the text, which belongs to almost all the manuscripts and edition 1; for *virtue* is appropriated to the very terminus of the first divine emanation or the Son (see below, d. 32 a. 2 q. 2 to the end.), indeed *love* is appropriated to the terminus of the second emanation or the Holy Spirit. (d. 10 a. 2 q. 1).

---

p. 2

Secundo, propter *spatiositatem* dicitur fluvius rerum mundanarum productio, ob quam causam non tantum fluvius, sed mare a Propheta dicitur in Psalmo[1] iste mundus: *Hoc mare magnum et spatiosum* etc. De hoc fluvio Ezechielis vigesimo nono:[2] *Ecce ego ad te Pharao, re Ægypti, draco magne, qui cubas in medio fluminum et dicis: Meus est fluvius, et ego feci memetipsum. Et ponam frenum in maxillis tuis* etc. Draco iste magnus, quem Dominus alloquitur et

Second, on account of its *spaciousness* an extension of mundane things is called a river, because of which reason this world is called not only a river, but the sea by the Prophet in the Psalm:[1] *This sea, great and spacious* etc. This river is spoken of in the twenty-ninth chapter of Ezechiel:[2] *Behold I (come) for you Pharaoh, king of Egypt, who recline in the midst of the streams and say: "Mine is the river, and I made it Myself." I will place a bridle upon your jaws* etc. That

cui comminatur in figura et persona Pharaonis, diabolus est, qui est rex Ægypti,[3] quoniam regnat in eis, quos excaecavit tenebris erroris, ut puta sunt haeretici, ad quos[4] etiam dicit: *Meus est fluvius, et ego feci memetispum,* quasi ipse fecerit mundum istum et ipse non habeat aliud principium. Hunc errorem ipse dixit et suggessit[5] impiis Manichaeis, qui totam machinam visibilium ad Deo malo esse conditam contendunt. Huius draconis maxillas Dominus *infrenabit,*[6] quando ablata sibi potestate suggerendi falsa, ostendet, se esse huius fluvii conditorem; unde in eadem auctoritate sequitur: *Scient omnes habitatores Ægypti, quoniam ego Dominus.*

great dragon, to whom the Lord speaks and which He threatens in the figure and person of the Pharaoh, is the Devil, who is the king of Egypt,[3] since he reigns in those, whom he has thoroughly blinded with the darkness of error, as heretics are reckoned to be, to whom[4] he also says: *Mine is the river, and I made it Myself,* as if to say that he himself had made this world and he himself has no other beginning. He mentioned this error and suggested it[5] for the sake of the impious Manicheans, who contend that the entire machine of visible things was established by an evil god. The jaws of this dragon the Lord *shall crush*,[6] when with his power to suggest false things born away, He will show, that He is the Establisher of this river; whence in the same authority it follows: *Let all the inhabitants of Egypt know, that I am the Lord.*

Tertio, propter *circulationem* dicitur fluvius Filii Dei incarnatio, quoniam, sicut in circulo ultimum coniungitur principio, sic in incarnatione supremum coniungitur imo, ut Deus limo,[7] et primum postremo, ut Filius Dei aeternus homini condito die sexto. De hoc fluvio Ecclesiastici vigesimo quarto:[8] *Ego quasi fluvius Dorix, et sicut aquaeductus exivi de paradiso.* Dorix interpretatur generationis mendicamentum, et est ibi figurativus sermo, ut conversim intelligatur, id est, generatio medicamenti. Incarnatio enim Filii Dei nihi aliud fuit quam generatio medicamenti: *Vere enim languores nostros ipse tulit et infirmitates nostras ipse portavit.*[9] Recte igitur Filii incarnatio fluvius Dorix dicitur. Et ipse Christus[10] de se vere dicit: *Ego quasi fluvius Dorix,* id est, medicinalis fluvius, *et sicut aquaeductus exivi de paradiso.* Natura aquae haec[11] est, quod tantum ascendit, quantum descendit. Talis fuit exitus incarnationis, secundum quod dicitur in Psalmo:[12] *A summo coelo egressio eius, et occursus eius usque ad summum eius.* Et Joannis decimo sexto:[13] *Exivi a Patre et veni in mundum: iterum relinquo mundum et vado ad Patrem,* et ita fecit circulam. De hoc etiam fluvio quantum ad egressum eius ex matre potest exponi illud, quod dicitur Esther decimo[14] in somnio Marddochaei: *Parvulus rivulus crevit in fluvium, et in*

Third, on account of its *circulation* the Incarnation of the Son of God is called a river, since, as in a circle the last is conjoined with the beginning, so in the Incarnation the highest is conjoined with the lowest, that is God to slime,[7] and the first to the last, as the eternal Son of God to the man established on the sixth day. Of this river the twenty-fourth chapter of Ecclesiastes (says):[8] *I, like the river Dorix, and as an aqueduct have gone forth from paradise.* "Dorix" is interpreted "medicine of generation", and this is a figurative way of speaking, to be understood conversely, that is, as "generation of medicine". For the Incarnation of the Son of God was nothing other than a generation of medicine: *For truly has He born our weaknesses and carried our infirmities.*[9] Therefore rightly is the Incarnation of the Son called the river Dorix. And Christ[10] Himself truly says of Himself: *I like the river Dorix,* that is, a medicinal river, *and as an aqueduct I have gone forth from paradise.* The nature of water is this,[11] that as much as it ascends, it descends. Such was the going forth of the Incarnation, according to what is said in the Psalm:[12] *From the highest Heaven His stepping forth, and His meeting even unto His height.* And the sixteenth chapter of John:[13] *I have gone forth from the Father and have come into the world; again I leave*

lucem solemque conversus est. Quis, obsecro, est paruvulus rivulus iste nisi humillima virgo? Haec crevit in fluvium, cum generavit Christum, qui non solum fluvius per[15] abundantiam gratiae, sed etiam lux sapientiae et sol iustitiate dicitur, secundum quod Ioannes capitulo primo[16] de ipso dicit: *Erat lux vera* etc.

the world and I go to the Father, and so He made a circle. Also concerning this river, as much as regards His stepping forth from His mother, there can be expounded, that, which is said in the tenth chapter of Esther[14] in the dream of Mordechai: *A tiny rivulet sprung into the river, and was converted into light and into the sun.* Who, I beseech, is this tiny rivulet except the most humble Virgin? She sprang into the river, when She generated Christ, who was not only a river through[15] an abundance of grace, but also is called the Light of wisdom and the Sun of justice, according to what John says of Him in his first[16] chapter: *He was the true light* etc..

Quarto, propter *emundationem* dicitur fluvius Sacramentorum dispensatio, quae sine sui pollutione mundat nos a coinquinationibus peccatorum. De hoc fluvio Apocalypsis vigesimo secundo:[17] *Ostendit mihi fluvium aquae vivae splendidum tamquam crystallum, procedentem de sede Dei et Agni.* Sacramentorum dispensatio dicitur fluvius *spendidus tamquam crystallus* propter claritatem et nitorem, quem relinquit in animabus, quae in hoc flumine depurantur. Dicitur etiam fluvius *aquae vivae* propter efficaciam gratiae, quae vivificat animam. Hic etiam *procedit de sede Dei et Agni.* Nam sacramentalis gratia procedit *a Deo* tamquam ab auctore[18] et efficiente, *a Christo* tanquam a mediatore et a promerente. Propter quod dicuntur omnia Sacramenta efficaciam habere a passione Chrisiti; unde testatur Augustinus:[19] « De latere Christi dormientis / fluxerunt Sacramenta, dum inde fluxit sanguis et aqua » .

Fourth, on account of its *cleansing* the dispensation of the Sacraments is called a river, which without themselves being polluted, cleanse us from the contaminations [coninquinationibus] of sins. Concerning this river the twenty-second chapter of the Apocalypse (says):[17] *He showed me the river of living waters, splendid as crystal, proceeding (down) from the throne of God and of the Lamb.* The dispensation of the Sacraments is called a river *splendid as crystal* on account of the clarity and brilliance, which it leaves in the souls, who are washed in this river. It is also called a river *of living waters* on account of its efficacy of grace, which vivifies the soul. This (river) also *proceeds from the throne of God and of the Lamb.* For sacramental grace proceeds *from God* as from its Author[18] and its efficient cause, *from Christ* as from its Mediator and from the One who merited it. On account of which all the Sacraments are said to have efficacious grace from the Passion of Christ, whence Augustine testifies:[19] From the side of the sleeping Christ / flowed the Sacraments, while blood and water flowed from there.

---

[1] 103, 25. — Paulo ante plurimi codd. ut A B C D G H I K M O P R S T W ee et ed. 1 omittunt *causam*; lectio non spernenda, forte sincerior, in qua relativum *quam* refertur ad *spatiositatem.*

[2] Vers. 3. Vulgata in hoc textu post *fluminum* addit *tuorum*; immediate post edd. 4 et 6 habent *qui* pro *et.*

[3] Fide mss. et ed. 1 expunximus propositionem in Vat. hic adiunctum *quae interpretatur tenebrae.*

[1] Psalm 103:25 — A little before this very many of the codices, such as A B C D G H I K M O P R S T W ee and edition 1 omit *reason* [causam]; the reading, not to be spurned, is much more genuine, in so far as the relative *which* refers to *spaciousness.*

[2] Verse 3. The Vulgate in this passage reads *of your streams*; immediately afterward edition 4 and 6 have *who* in place of *and.*

[3] Trusting the manuscripts and edition 1, we have

Immediate post cod. O *qui* loco *quoniam.*
[4] Vat. *quem,* sed omnino false, uti ex ipso contextu patet, re repugnantibus mss. cum ed. 1.
[5] Codd. K V et ed. 1 addunt *et suggerit,* alii vero ut codd. A T pro *suggessit* legunt *suggerit* respectu Manichaeorum tempore S. Doctoris viventium. Mox, postulantibus mss. ac edd. 1, 2, 3, post *conditam* expunximus *asserunt et.*
[6] Cod. U *refrenabit.* Dein codd. B C D G I O T W X Z bb minus bene *quoniam,* cod. A *qui* loco *quando.* Paulo post sub verbis *in eadem auctoritate* intellige Ezech. 29, 6 ubi et Vulgata cum ed. 1 legit *quia* pro *quoniam.*
[7] Verba in Vat. omissa *ut Deus limo* adiecimus ope mss. et ed. 1. Cfr. Liber de Spiritu et anima c. 14. — Paulo ante cod. ee cum ed. 1 legit *coniunctum est* loco *coniungitur.* In fine propositionis codd. A C F I M S T ect. *sexto*; Vat. *sexta.*
[8] Vers. 41. Vulgata: *Ego quasi fluvii Dioryx et sicut* etc. Idem recurrit paulo infra. Sed vide Lyranum et Cardinalem Hugonem de S. Charo super hunc locum.
[9] Isaiae 53, 4, in quo textu Vulgata pro *infirmitates nostras* legit *dolores nostros.*
[10] Praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 non bene deest in Vat. *Christus.*
[11] Refragantibus codd. et ed. 1, ponit Vat. *huius*, sed mendose, quia subnexa conveniunt non solum huic ve illi aquae, sed omni.
[12] 18,7 (6).
[13] Vers. 28.
[14] Vers. 6, in quo textu hic et paulo post Vat. *parvus,* dissentientibus mss. et ed. 1; Vulgata autem: *Parvus fons, qui crevit* etc. Paulo ante codd. I T omittunt *quod dicitur,* pro quo Vat. cum ed. 1 et una alterove cod. *quod dicit.*
[15] Codd. H ee *propter*; dein cod. M *superabundantiam.*
[16] Vers. 9.
[17] Vers. 1.
[18] Auctoritate plurium codd. ut K R Y Z ee substituimus *auctore* pro *actore*, ut habet Vat. Utrumque verbum a codd. saepe eodem modo scribitur. Mox ed. 1 post *Christo* addit particulam *vero.*
[19] In Iannis Evang. c. 2. Tract. 9. n. 10: Dormienti Adae fit Eva de latere; mortuo Christo lancea percuitur latus , ut profluant Sacramenta, quibus formetur Ecclesia. Vide etiam libr. Sentent. ex Augustino decerptarum (qui est Prosperi / Aquitanis) Sent. 329 — Paulo ante ex codd. A C F G H I K P R S T U X Y aa bb ee et ed. 1 posuimus *unde* loco *ut*. Deinde codd. S aa bb cum ed. 1 teste Augustino pro testatur Augustinus, in cuius verbis cod. M post *fluxerunt* addit *ecclesiae.*

expunged the passage in the Vatican edition, which is added here: *which is interpreted darkness.* Immediately afterwards codex O has *who* in place of *since he.*
[4] The Vatican edition has *who,* but this is entirely false, as is clear from the context itself, and repugnant to the manuscripts with edition 1.
[5] Codices K V and edition 1 add *and suggests it,* indeed the others, such as codices A and T for *he suggested it* read *he suggests it* in regard to the Manicheans living in the time of the Seraphic Doctor.
[6] Codex U reads *shall rein in* Then codices B C D G I O T W X Z bb have the not so good reading *since*, codex A has *who* in place of *when.* A little afterwards by the words *in the same authority* understand Ezekiel 29:6 where even the Vulgate with edition 1 reads *because* for *since.*
[7] We have added the words omitted in the Vatican edition *that is God to slime* with the assistance of the manuscripts and edition 1. Cf. The Book on the Spirit and the Soul, chapter 14. — A little before this codex ee with edition 1 reads *has been conjoined* in place of *is conjoined.* At the end of the passage codices A C F I M S T etc. have *sixth* [sexto]; the Vatican edition has *sixth* [sexta].
[8] Verse 41 in the Vulgate reads *I like the Dioryx of the river and as* etc. Likewise this recurs a little below. But see (Nicholas) of Lyre and Cardinal Hugo of S. Charo on this verse. [Trans. note: cf. also Cornelius a Lapidé, vol. V, 1841 ed. pp.574-6.]
[9] Isaiah 53:4, in which passage the Vulgate reads *our sorrows* for *our infirmities.*
[10] On account of our trust in the manuscripts and edition 1, *Christ* is badly lacking in the Vatican edition.
[11] With the codices and edition 1 opposing it, the Vatican edition puts *The nature of this water is,* but faultily, because what is subjoined is appropriate not only to this or that water, but all water.
[12] Psalm 18:7 (6)
[13] Verse 28.
[14] Verse 6, in which passage the Vatican edition has here and a little afterwards *small* not *tiny,* though the manuscripts and edition 1 disagree; the Vulgate however has : *A little fountain, which sprung* etc. A little before this codices I and T omit *which is said,* for that which the Vatican edition with edition 1 and one other codex have as *which . . . says.*
[15] Codices H and ee have *on account of*; then codex M has *superabundance*
[16] Verse 9.
[17] Verse 1.
[18] On the authority of very many codices, such as K R Y Z and ee we substitute *author* for *agent*, which the Vatican edition has. Each word is often written in codices in the same manner. Then edition 1 adds after *Christ* the adversative *but.*
[19] On the Gospel of John, chapter 2 Tract 9, n. 10: "From the sleeping Adam Eve is made from his side; after Christ died His side was pierced with the lance, so that the Sacraments would flow forth, by which the Church is formed". See also the book of quotations taken from Augustine (which is by Prosper / of Aquitaine) n. 329 — A little before this on

account of codices A C F G H I K P R S T U X Y aa bb ee and edition 1 we put *whence* in place of *as*. Then codices S aa bb with edition 1 have *with Augustine as witness* for *Augustine testifies,* among whose words codex M adds *of the Church* after *the Sacraments.*

---

p. 3

fluxerunt Sacramenta, dum inde fluxit sanguis et aqua » .

flowed the Sacraments, while blood and water flowed from there.

De omnibus istis fluviis simul et per ordinem habetur Genesis secundo,[1] ubi dicitur, quod *fluvius egrediebatur de loco voluptatis, qui inde dividitur in quatuor capita: nomen primi Phiso, nomen secundi Gehon, nomen terii Tigris et nomen quarti Euphrates.* Fluvius iste egrediens de Paradiso est totius libri huius materia. Quatuor fluvii ex isto procedentes sunt speciales materiae quatuor librorum, sicut facile potest aptare, qui praedictorum nominum interpretationes vult diligenter exponere.[2] Phison enim interpretatur oris mutatio, et in hoc significatur personarum emanatio. Sicut enim ex ore materiali procedit verbum et spiritus, ita ex ore Patris Filius et Spiritus sanctus, Ecclesiastici vigesimo quarto:[3] *Ego ex ore Altissimi prodii, primogenita ante omnem creaturam.* Hoc dicit ipse Filius, quis est Verbum et Sapientia Patris. Et in Psalmo:[4] *Verbo Domini caeli firmati sunt: et spiritus oris eius* etc. Gehon interpretatur arena, et in hoc significatur rerum mundanarum productio. Sicut enim universitas creaturarum comparatur mari propter spatiositatem, ita arenae propter numerositatem, Ecclesiatici primo:[5] *Arenam maris et pluviae guttas quis dinumeravit?* Tigris interpretatur sagitta, et in hoc significatur Filli Dei incarnatio. Sicut enim in sagitta ferrum coniunctum est ligno, sic in Christo fortitudo divinitatis coniuncta est moillitieti humanitatis. Et sicut sagitta ex arcu et ligno, sic in Christo fortitudo divinitatis coniuncta est mollitiei humanitatis. Et sicut sagitta ex arcu et ligno volat ad percutiendum adversarios, sic Christus de cruce saliens confregit adversarium. Haec est illa sagitta, de qua dicitur quarti Regum decimo tertio:[6] *Sagitta salutis Domini, et sagitta salutis contra Syriam.* Euphrates interpretatur frugifer, in quo significatur Sacramentorum

All these rivers are contained at once and in order in the second[1] chapter of Genesis, where it is said, that *the river stepped forth from the place of pleasure, which from there divided into four sources: the name of the first, Phiso, the name of the second, Gehon, the name of the third, Tigris, and the name of the fourth, Euphrates.* That river stepping forth form Paradise is the entire matter of this Book. The four rivers proceeding from that (river) are the specific [speciales] matters of the four books, as one can easily adapt, who wants to diligently explain[2] the interpretations of the aforesaid names. For Phiso is interpreted "mouth of change", and in this there is signified the emanation of Persons. For as out of a material mouth there proceeds word and spirit, so, out of the mouth of the Father, the Son and Holy Spirit, (as is said) in the twenty-fourth chapter of Ecclesiasticus:[3] *I went forth out of the mouth of the Most High, first born before every creature.* This the Son Himself says, who is the Word and Wisdom of the Father. And in the Psalm:[4] *By the Word of the Lord the heavens have been made firm: and the Spirit of His mouth* etc.. Gehon is interpreted "sand", and in this there is signified the extension of mundane things. For as the universe of creatures is compared to the sea on account of its spaciousness, so the sands on account of their numerosity, (as is said) in the first chapter of Ecclesiasticus:[5] *Sand of the sea and drops of the rain, who can count them?* Tigris is interpreted "arrow", and in this there is signified the Incarnation of the Son of God. For as in an arrow iron has been conjoined with wood, so in Christ the fortitude of the Divinity has been conjoined to the pliability of humanity. And as an arrow flies from bow and wood to strike one's adversaries, so did Christ, springing

dispensatio, quae non tantum animam purgant a culpa, sed etiam fecundant in gratia. Quod significatum est Apocalypsi ultimo,[7] ubi dicitur, quod iuxta fluvium crystallinum *erat lignum afferens fructum, cuius folia erant in medicinam.*

(down) from the Cross, destroy the Adversary. This is that arrow, of which there is said in the thirteenth chapter of Kings:[6] *Arrow of the Lord's salvation, and arrow of salvation against Syria.* Euphrates is interpreted "fruit-bearing", in which there is signified the dispensation of the Sacraments, which not only purge the soul from fault, but even fecundate it in grace. Which has been signified in the last chapter of the Apocalypse,[7] where it is said, that along the crystalline river *there was a tree bearing fruit, whose leaves were for medicine.*

Cum igitur quator sint fluvii, quatuor sunt fluviorum *profunda* praedictis fluviis correspondentia.

Therefore since four are the rivers, four are the *depths* of the rivers corresponding to the aforesaid rivers.

Profundum *aeternae emanationis* est sublimitas esse divini, de quo potest intelligi illud Ecclesiatici septimo:[8] *Alta profunditas, quis inveniet eam?* Vere profunditas alta et altitudo profunda, ita ut exclamet Apostolus ad Romanos undecimo[9] et dicat: *O altitudo divitiarum sapientiae et scientiae Dei, quam incomprehensibilia sunt iudicia eius, et investigabiles viae eius!* Vere iudicia incomprehensibilia, quia profunda. *Iudicia enim Dei abyssus multa,*[10] et Ecclesiastici primo:[11] *Profundum abyssi quis dimensus est?* Haec profunditas innuitur Iob undecimo:[12] *Forsitan vestigia Dei comprehendes et usque ad perfectum Omnipotentem reperies? Excelsior coelo est, et quid facies? profundior inferno, et unde cognosces?* quasi dicat: ex te non potes: ideo consulit Apostolus ad Ephesios tertio:[13] *In caritate radicati et fundati, ut possitis comprehendere* etc.

The depth of the *eternal emanation* is the loftiness of Divine Being [esse], of which there can be understood that (which is said) in the seventh chapter of Ecclesiasticus:[8] *High profundity, who will find it?* Truly so high a profundity and so profound a height, that the Apostle exclaims in the eleventh chapter to the Romans[9] and says: *O height of the riches of the wisdom and the knowledge of God, how incomprehensible are His judgments, and unsearchable His ways!* Truly incomprehensible judgments, because profound. *For the judgments of God (are as) the many things of the abyss.*[10] and in the first chapter of Ecclesiasticus:[11] *Depth of the abyss, who has measured it?* This profundity is hinted at in the eleventh chapter of Job:[12] *Perhaps you comprehend the footprints of God and repair even to the perfect Omnipotent? He is more exalted than Heaven, and what will you make? more profound than Hell, and whence will you know* [cognosces] *?* as if he were to say: "You are not able of yourself": for that reason the Apostle counsels (us) in the third chapter to the Ephesians:[13] *Be rooted and founded upon charity, so that you may be able to comprehend* etc..

Et hoc *profundum* perscrutatur Magister in primo libro. Sublimitas enim divini esse consistit in duobus, scilicet in nobilissimis *emanationibus,* quae sunt generatio et processio, et[14] in nobilissimis *conditionibus,*

And this *depth* the Master thoroughly scrutinizes in the first book. For the loftiness of Divine Being [esse] consists in two things, namely in the noblest *emanations*, which are generation and procession, and[14] in the

quae sunt summa sapientia, omnipotentia et perfecta voluntas, de quibus est primus liber. Nam in prima parte agit de sacratissima Unitate et Trinitate, in secunda vero[15] speciali tractatu agit de supradicta eius triplici conditione sive proprietate.

Profundum *creationis* est vanitas esse creati. Creatura enim quanto magis evanescit, tanto magis in profundum tendit, sive evanescat per culpam sive per poenam. Propter hoc dicitur per Prophetam in persona hominis, qui evanuit per culpam, in Psalmo:[16] *Infixus sum in limo profundi, et non est substantia.* Et rursus orans Propheta, ne evanescat per poenam: *Non me demergat, inquit, tempestas aquae, neque absorbeat me profundum* etc.

Hoc profundum scrutatur Magister in secundo / libro.

Aquitanis) Sent. 329 — Paulo ante ex codd. A C F G H I K P R S T U X Y aa bb ee et ed. 1 posuimus *unde* loco *ut*. Deinde codd. S aa bb cum ed. 1 teste Augustino pro testatur Augustinus, in cuius verbis cod. M post *fluxerunt* addit *ecclesiae.*

[1] Vers. 10-14, ubi Vulgata post *voluptatis* addit *ad irrigandum Paradisum* et nomina fluminum ita enumerat: Nomen uni Phison... et nomen fluvii secundi Gehon... Nomen vero fluminis tertii, Tigris... Fluvius autem quartus, ipse est Euphrates. Plures codd. A F G I S W Y etc. cum edd. 1, 2, 3, 6 nomen secundi fluvii sic exhibent *Gyon.* — Paulo ante cod. M *secundum* loco *per.*
[2] Cod. ee et ed. 1 *considerare.*
[3] Vers. 5, ubi Vulgata *prodivi* pro *prodii.*
[4] 32, 6.
[5] Vers. 2, in quo textu Vat. cum Vulgata post *guttas* addit *et dies saeculi.* — Paulo ante substituimus ex codd. A C G H I O R S T U Y Z bb ee ff et ed. 1 *numerositatem* pro *innumerositatem,* licet utraque lectio in idem recidat.
[6] Vers. 17.
[7] Vers. 2, ubi Vulgata: Lignum vitae afferens fructus duodecim, per menses singulos reddens fructum suum et folia ligni ad sanitatem gentium.
[8] Vers. 25.
[9] Vers. 33, in quo textu fide codd. et ed. 1 addimus *et investigabililes viae eius,* quod omittit Vat.
[10] Psalm 35, 7, ubi Vulgata: Iudicia tua abyssus multa.

noblest *conditions,* which are the highest wisdom, omnipotence and perfect will, of which is the first book. For in the first part he deals with the Most Sacred Unity and Trinity, but in the second[15] with a special tract, he deals with His above said threefold condition or property.

The depth of *creation* is the vanity of created being [esse]. For the creature in as much as it is more vanishing, so much more does it tend into the depth, either vanishing through fault or through punishment. On account of this there is said through the Prophet in the person of a man, who vanished through fault, in the Psalm:[16] *I have been thrust into the slime of the deep, and there is no substance.* And again the Prophet praying, lest he vanish through punishment: *Do not let it submerge me, he said, the storm of water, nor let it swallow me the depth* etc..

This depth the Master scrutinizes in the second / book.

of Aquitaine) n. 329 — A little before this on account of codices A C F G H I K P R S T U X Y aa bb ee and edition 1 we put *whence* in place of *as*. Then codices S aa bb with edition 1 have *with Augustine as witness* for *Augustine testifies,* among whose words codex M adds *of the Church* after *the Sacraments.*

[1] Verses 10-14, where the Vulgate adds *to irrigate Paradise* after *of pleasure* and enumerates the names of the rivers in this fashion: *The name of one, Phison,... and the name of the second river, Gehon,...indeed the name of the third river, Tigris,...moreover the fourth river, is itself the Euphrates.* Many codices A F G I S W Y etc. with editions 1, 2, 3, 6 spell the name of the second river thus Gyon. — A little before this codex M has *according to their order* in place of *in order.*
[2] Codex ee and edition 1 have *consider.*
[3] Verse 5, where the Vulgate has *prodivi* [went forth] for *prodii* [went forth.]
[4] Psalm 32:6.
[5] Verse 3, in which text the Vatican manuscript with the Vulgate adds *and the days of a generation* after *rain*. — A little before we have substituted from codices A C G H I O R S T U Y Z bb ee ff and edition 1 *numerosity* for *innumerableness,* though each reading has the same meaning.
[6] Verse 17.
[7] Verse 2, where the Vulgate reads: *The tree of life bearing twelve fruits, bearing its own fruit throughout every month and the leaves of the wood*

[11] Vers. 2.
[12] Vers. 7. et 8.
[13] Vers. 17. et 18.
[14] Perturbatam lectionem Vat., in qua omittitur particula *et* ipsiusque loco ponitur punctum, ita ut cum sequenti praepositione *in* nova incipiat propositio, emendavimus ex mss. et ed. 1.
[15] Inserta est hic in Vat. sequens propositio: *quae incipit in distinct.* 35: *Cumque supra disserverimus* etc., quam ut interpolatam auctoritate codd. et ed. 1 removimus.
[16] 68, 2. Textus s. Scripturae proxime sequens habetur in eodem Psalmo 68, 16.

were for the healing of the nations.
[8] Verse 25.
[9] Verse 33, in which text, trusting in the codices and edition 1, we have added *and how unsearchable are His ways,* which the Vatican edition omits.
[10] Psalm 35:7, where the Vulgate reads: *Thy judgments are as the many things of the abyss.*
[11] Verse 2.
[12] Verse 7 and 8.
[13] Verse 17 and 18.
[14] The Vatican edition has a confused reading, in which the conjunction *and* is omitted and there is put in its place a period, so that with the following preposition *in* there begins a new sentence: we have emended this from the manuscripts and edition 1.
[15] There has been inserted here in the Vatican edition the following sentence: "which he begins in distinction 35: And since we observed above etc.", which we have removed as an interpolation on the authority of the codices and edition 1.
[16] Psalm 68:2. The text of Sacred Scripture which follows is found in the same Psalm 68:16.

---

p. 4

libro. Nam vanitas esse creati in duobus consistit, videlicet in mutatione de *non esse* in *esse* et rursum in reversione in *non esse.* Et quamvis nulla creatura omnino cedat in non ens per naturam, tamen, sicut dicit Augustinus,[1] peccator tendit ad non esse per culpam. Et de his duobus est totus secundus. Nam in prima parte agit de rerum egressu, in secunda vero parte[2] agit de lapsu, ut de tentatione diaboli, de peccato originali et actuali, usque in finem.

book. For the vanity of the created being [esse creati] consists in two things, viz. in change from non-being [non esse] to being [esse] and again in the reversion into non-being [non esse]. And although no creature passes entirely into non-being [non ens] through nature, nevertheless, as Augustine says,[1] the sinner tends to not to be [non esse] through fault. And of these two is the entire second (book). For in the first part he deals with the stepping-forth of things, but in the second part[2] he deals with the Fall, as it concerns temptation by the devil, original sin and actual sin, through to the end of the book.

Profundum *incarnationis* est meritum humanitatis[3] Christi, quod tantum fuit, ut vere possit dici profundum, quasi non habens terminum nec fundum. De quo potest intelligi illud Ionae secundo:[4] *Proiecisti me in profundum in corde matris, et flumen circumdedit me.* Hoc potest dici de Christo, qui tantum humiliatus est, ut vere possit dici *proiectus* et *abiectus,* Isaiae quinquagesimo tertio:[5] *Et vidimus eum, et non erat ei aspectus, et desideravimus eum: despectum et novissimum virorum* etc. Vere igitur dicit se proiectum, sed ubi? *in profundum maris et fluminis.* Nam passio Christi comparatur *mari* propter poenalitatis

The depth of the Incarnation is the merit of the humanity[3] of Christ, which was so great, so that it can truly be called a depth, as if not having a terminus nor bottom. Of this there can be understood that (which is said) in the second chapter of Jonas:[4] *Thou has cast me forth into the depth in the heart of my mother, and the stream has surrounded me.* This can be said of Christ, who was so humiliated, that truly he could be said to be *cast forth* and *abject,* (as is said) in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah:[5] *And we have seen him, and no attractiveness belonged to him, and we desired him: despised and the last of men* etc. Truly therefore He calls himself

amaritudinem, sed et[6] *flumini* propter caritatis dulcedinem. Dulcissimum enim cor Iesu Christi tanta circa[7] nos afficiebatur teneritudine amoris, ut non videretur ei grave pro nobis sustinere extremum et acerbissimum genus mortis.

"cast-forth", but where? *in the depth of the sea and of the stream.* For the Passion of Christ is compared to *the sea* on account of the bitterness of its penalty, but also[6] to *a stream* on account of the sweetness of its charity. For the most sweet Heart of Jesus Christ was stirred with such great a tenderness of love for[7] us, that it did not seem heavy for Him to sustain on our behalf an extreme and most bitter kind of death.

Et hoc profundum perscrutatur Magister in tertio. Nam meritum Christi in duobus consistit, scilicet in *passione,* per quam nos redemit, et in *actione,* per quam nos informavit, quae consistit in operibus virtutum, donorum et praeceptorum, de quibus duobus est tertius liber. Nam in prima parte agitur de incarnatione et passione, in qua consistit nostra redemptio, in secunda[8] de virtutibus, donis et praeceptis, in quibus consistit nostra informatio.

And this depth the Master thoroughly scrutinizes in the third book. For the merit of Christ consists in two things, namely in His *Passion,* through which He redeemed us, and in His *action,* through which He formed [informavit] us, which consists in His works of virtue, of gifts, and of precepts, of which two things is the third book. For in the first part the Incarnation and Passion are dealt with, in which consists our redemption, in the second[8] the virtues, gifts, and precepts, in which consist our formation [informatio].

Profundum *sacramentalis despensationis* est efficacia perfecti medicamenti. Tanta enim est efficacia medicinae sacramentalis, quod humanam mentem excedit, ut vere profundum possit dici. De hoc Isaiae quinquagesimo primo:[9] *Posuisti profundum maris viam tuam, ut transirent liberati.* Profundum istud, in quo Ægyptii demerguntur et filii Israel[10] liberati transeunt et salvantur, est efficacia Sacramentorum, in quibus destruuntur opera tenebrarum et conferuntur arma lucis et dona gratiarum, per quae homo transfertur de potestate tenebrarum in regnum filii caritatis Dei. Haec efficacia Sacramentorum est profundum *maris* et *fluminis: maris,*[11] in quantum primo liberat a culpa et introducit in amaritudinem poenitentiae; *fluminis,* in quantum liberat a miseria et introducit in dulcedinem gloriae.[12] Quod optime praesignatum fuit in filiis Israel, quibus exeuntibus ex Ægypto siccatum est mare, et transierunt *per siccum in medio eius,* sicut dicitur Exodi decimo quinto;[13] et introeuntibus in terram promissionis siccatus est fluvius, et transierunt per medium eius, sicut dicitur Iosue quarto.[14]

The depth of the *sacramental dispensation* is the efficacy of a perfect medicine. For so great is the efficacy of sacramental medicine, that it exceeds the human mind, so that it can truly be called a depth. Of this (there is said) in the fifty-first chapter of Isaiah:[9] *Thou has placed the depth of the sea as Thy way, so that they (who) have been freed might pass over.* That depth, in which the Egyptians are submerged and the sons of Israel,[10] having been freed, pass over and are saved, is the efficacy of the Sacraments, in which the works of darkness are destroyed and there are conferred the arms of light and the gifts of graces, through which man is transferred from the power of darkness into the Kingdom of the Son of God of charity. This efficacy of the Sacraments is a depth *of a sea* and *of a stream: of a sea*,[11] in as much as at first it frees from fault and introduces one into the bitterness of penitence; *of a stream*, in as much as it frees from misery and introduces one into the sweetness of glory.[12] Which was pre-signified best of all in the sons of Israel, for whom, as they went forth from Egypt, the sea was dried up, and they passed over *through dry land in its midst,* as is said in the fifteenth chapter of Exodus;[13]

and for those entering into the land of promise the river was dried up, and they passed over through its midst, as is said in the fourth chapter of Josuah.[14]

Hoc profundum perscrutatur Magister in quarto libro. Nam efficacia perfecti medicamenti in duobus consistit, scilicet in *sanatione* a varietate infirmitatum deprimentium et in *liberatione* ab universitate miseriarum aggravantium; et de his duobus est totus quartus liber. Nam in prima parte agit de multiplici *sanatione,* quam efficiunt septem Sacramenta. In secunda[15] agit de *perfecta sanitate,* ad quam perducunt, sicut de *gloria resurgentium,* qui veraciter et fideliter Sacramenta Ecclesiae perceperunt; et per oppositum de *poena malorum,* qui Sacramenta Ecclesiae contempserunt.

This depth the Master thoroughly scrutinizes in the fourth book. For the efficacy of perfect medicine consists in two things, namely in its *healing* of a variety of depressing infirmities and in its *freeing* from the totality of worsening miseries; and of these two is the entire fourth book. For in the first part he deals with the manifold *healing,* which the seven Sacraments effect. In the second[15] he deals with *perfect healing,* to which they lead, as with *the glory of the resurrected,* who truly and faithfully perceived the Sacraments of the Church; and contrariwise with *the punishments of the wicked,* who contemned the Sacraments of the Church.

Ex perscrutatione autem quatuor profundorum in quatuor libris elicitur *finis,* scilicet revelatio *quatuor absconditorum.*

Moreover from the thorough scrutiny of the four depths in the four books there is elicited their *end,* namely the revelation of *four hidden things.*

---

[1] Verba ex Augustino citata non verbotenus in eiudem operibus inveniuntur, sed tantum quoad sensum; de quo vide VII. Confess. c. 16; de Vera Religione c. 11. et XIV de Civ. Dei, c. 13. — Cod. X cum ed. 1 habet *tendat* pro *cedat*, et codd. F H aa *in non esse* pro *in non ens*; in seq. propositione post *secundus* plures codd. B E H K P V W X ff addunt *liber.*
[2] Vat. contra auctoritatem mss. et ed. 1 hic addit *quae incipit in distinctione 24: Videns igitur diabolus* etc. moxque pro *in finem* legit *ad finem.*
[3] Praeter fidem mss.. ac edd. 1, 2, 3 ponit Vat. humilitatis. Mox codd. F I T propositionem cum verbo terminum concludentes alteram ita incipiunt: *Hoc est profundum de quo* etc., lectio non spernenda.
[4] Vers. 4.
[5] Vers. 2.3, ubi Vulgata post erat omittit ei.
[6] Indebitam omissionem verborum *sed et* emendavimus ope fere omnium codd. et ed. 1.
[7] Cod. Y erga.
[8] Propositio, quam hic Vat. interserit: quae incipit in distinctione 23: Cum vero supra habitum sit etc. agitur, deest in mss. et ed. 1.
[9] Vers. 10, ubi Vulgata omittit *tuam*.
[10] Supplevimus ex pluribus codd. K F S T X Y ee etc. ac ed. 1 *Israel*.
[11] Mutilam Vat. lectionem, in qua abest et fluminis: maris, restauramus ex mss. et ed. 1.
[12] Vat. cum plurimis codd. gratiae loco gloriae contra codd. aa et bb, quorum tamen lectionem genuinam iudicamus, tum quia in secunda parte quarti libri

---

[1] The words cited from Augustine are not found literally in his works, but only in regard to the sense [of his teaching]; concerning this see book VII of the Confessions, chapter 16; On the True Religion, chapter 11 and book XIV of the City of God, chapter 13. — [A little before this] codex X with edition 1 has *tends* in place of *passes,* and codices F H and aa *into non-being* [non esse] for *into non-being* [non ens]; in the following sentence after *second* many codices B E H K P V W X ff add *book.*
[2] The Vatican edition, against the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1, adds here *which begins in distinction 24: Therefore the devil seeing* etc. and then in place of *to the end* reads *toward the end*.
[3] Parting with the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3 the Vatican edition has *humility.* Then codices F I T concluding the sentence with the word *terminus,* begin the next differently: *This is the depth of which* etc., which is a reading not to be spurned.
[4] Verse 4.
[5] Verse 2.3, where the Vulgate omits *in him* after *there was.*
[6] We have emended this undue omission of the words *but also* with the help of nearly all the codices and edition 1.
[7] Codex Y has *for* [erga].
[8] The sentence, which the Vatican edition inserts here is : which begins in distinction 23: *But since this is considered above* etc.; *are dealt with* [agitur], is lacking in the manuscripts and in edition 1.
[9] Verse 10, where the Vulgate omits *your.*

Sententiarum agitur non de gratia, sed de gloria, tum quia subnexa tantummodo de gloria verificantur. — Paulo infra, sequendo plures codd. ut A F G H M T etc. cum ed. 1, substituimus *praesignatum* pro *praefiguratum.*
[13] Vers. 19, quem Vulgata ita proponit: *Filii autem Israel ambulaverunt per siccum in medio eius.* In codd. citatur c. 14, ubi v. 22. legitur: *Et ingressi sunt filii Israel per medium sicci maris.*
[14] Vers. 22-24. — Auctoritate mss. et ed. 1 castigavimus corruptam lectionem Vat. *ex Ægypto divisa est aqua, et transierunt per medium sicci maris, sicut dicitur: Et introeuntibus in terram promissionis per arentem alveum transivit Israel Iordanem istum, siccante Domino Deo nostro aquas eius etc. Simile dicitur in Iosue.*
[15] Propositio hic in Vat. adiecta quae incipit in distinctione 43: *Postremo de conditione resurrectionis* etc., non habetur in mss. nec in ed. 1. Mox ed. 1 pro *sicut* satis bene habet *scilicet.*

[10] We have supplied *Israel* on the basis of many codices K F S T X Y EE etc. and edition 1.
[11] We restore the mutilated reading of the Vatican edition, in which *and of a stream: of a sea* is lacking on the basis of the manuscripts and edition 1.
[12] The Vatican edition with very many codices has *of grace* in place of *of glory* contrary to codices aa and bb, whose reading nevertheless we judge to be genuine, because no only in the second part of the fourth book of the Sentences is grace not dealt with, but rather glory, but also because in the following paragraph only glory is dealt with. — A little below, following very many codices such as A F G H M T etc. with edition 1, we have substituted *pre-signified* in place of *prefigured.*
[13] Verse 19, which the Vulgate puts thus: *However the sons of Israel walked through dry land in its midst.* In the codices cited, chapter 22, verse 22 reads: *And the sons of Israel entered in through the midst of a dry sea.*
[14] Verse 22-24. — On the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1 we have corrected the corrupted reading of the Vatican edition `*The water was divided from Egypt, and they passed over through the midst of a dry sea, just as is said: And entering into the land of promise through a dry stream-bed Israel passed over that Jordan, with the Lord Our God drying up its waters'* etc. This is said in a similar manner in Joshua.
[15] The sentence added here in the Vatican edition which begins in distinction 43: *At last concerning the condition of the resurrection* etc., is not found in the manuscripts nor in edition 1. Then edition 1 has *namely* for *as*, which is just as sufficient.

---

p. 5

Primum est *magnitudo divinae substantiae,* de qua Isaiae quadragesimo quinto:[1] *Vere tu es Deus absconditus, Deus Israel Salvator.* Vere magnitudo divinae substantiae est abscondita secundum illud Iob vigesimo sexto:[2] *Cum vix parvulam stillam sermonis eius audierimus, magnitudinem tonitrui eius quis poterit intueri?* Certe nullus potest intueri, nisi ille, cum quo sapientia Dei inhabitat. Propter hoc petebat ille sapientiae amator, nono Sapientiae:[3] *Mitte illam de caelis sanctis tuis et a sede magnitudinis tuae.*

The First is *the magnitude of the Divine Substance,* of which in the fourty-fifth[1] chapter of Isaiah (it is said): *Truly Thou art a God hidden away, the God of Israel, the Savior.* Truly the magnitude of the Divine Substance is hidden away according to that (which is said) in the twenty-sixth[2] chapter of Job: *Since we have scarcely heard a tiny drop of His speech, who can gaze at the magnitude of His thunder?* Certainly no one can gaze upon it, except him, with whom the wisdom of God dwells. On account of this that lover of wisdom asked, in the ninth chapter of Wisdom:[3] *Send her from Thy holy heavens and from the throne of Thy magnitude.*

Hoc absconditum Magister, repletus sapientia de supernis, per primi libri perscrutationem produxit in lucem. Nam visis et intellectis nobilissimis emanationibus et nobilissimis

This hidden thing the Master, replete with wisdom from on high, brought to light through the thorough scrutiny of the first book. For with the noblest emanations and noblest properties seen and known, there

proprietatibus, innotescit nobis, secundum quod possibile est viatoribus, divinae substantiae magnitudo.

becomes known [innotescit] to us, according to what is possible for travelers, the magnitude of the Divine Substance.

Secundum abscondiutm est *ordo divinae sapientiae,* de quo Iob vigesimo octavo:[4] *Ubi invenitur sapientia? et quis est locus intelligentiae? abscondita est ab oculis omnium viventium.* Vere abscondita, quia, sicut dicitur ibidem,[5] *sapientia trahitur de occultis*; ita, ut cognoscatur, indiget perscrutatione profunditatis non in se, sed in operibus, in quibus ipsa relucet. Unde dicitur Ecclesiatici primo,[6] quod *unus est altissimus Creator, qui effudit illam super omnia opera sua.*

The second hidden thing is *the order of Divine Wisdom,* of which in the twenty-eighth[4] chapter of Job (it is said): *Where is wisdom found? and what is the place of understanding? it is hidden away from the eyes of all the living.* Truly hidden away, because, as is said in the same place,[5] *wisdom is brought from hidden places*; thus, for her to become known [cognoscatur], there needs to be a thorough scrutiny not of the profundity in her, but (of that) in her works, in which she herself glitters. Whence it is said in the first[6] chapter of Ecclesiasticus, that *one is the Most High Creator, who pours her forth upon all His works.*

Hoc igitur absconditum manifestat Magister in perscrutatione secundi. Nam viso ordine bonorum et malorum, patet nobis, quomodo ab aeterno sapientia Dei *ordinata* est *et ex antiquis, antequam terra fieret*.[7]

Therefore the Master manifests this hidden thing in the thorough scrutiny of the second book. For having seen the order of good and evil things, it is clear to us, in what manner the wisdom of God has been *ordained* from eternity and *from ancient times, before the earth was made*.[7]

Tertium absonditum est *fortitudo divinae potentiae,* de qua Habacuc tertio:[8] *Cornua in manibus eius: ibi abscondita est fortitudo eius;* loquitur de Christo pendente in cruce, ubi latuit foritudo virtutis sub pallio infirmitatis. Et *hoc est sacramentum absconditum a saeculis,* de quo ad Ephesios tertio:[9] *Mihi omnium Sanctorum minimo data est gratia haec in gentibus evangelizare investigabiles divitiae Christi et illuminare omnes, quae sit dispensatio sacramenti absconditi a saeculis in Deo.* Hoc est *sacramentum absconditum,* sacrum secretum, quod[10] Deus fortis, ut hostem vinceret, indutus est armis nostrae infirmitatis; quod est inauditum a saeculis.

The third hidden thing is *the fortitude of the Divine Power,* of which in the third chapter of Habakkuk (it is said):[8] *Horns (are) in His hands; there His fortitude has been hidden away*; this is said of Christ hanging on the Cross, where the fortitude of virtue lay hidden beneath the pallium of infirmity. And *this is the sacrament hidden away from the ages,* of which in the third chapter to the Ephesians (it is said):[9] *To me the least of all the Saints has been given this grace: to preach among the Gentiles the good news of the unsearchable riches of Christ* [evangelizare investigablies divitiae] *and to illumine all (as to), what is the dispensation of the sacrament hidden away in God from the ages.* This is *the sacrament hidden away,* the sacred secret, because[10] the Mighty God, to conquer the enemy, put on the arms of our infirmity; which is a thing unheard of by the ages.

In perscrutatione tamen[11] tertii libri, ubi ostenditur, quod Christus in sua infirmitate

Nevertheless[11] in the thorough scrutiny of the third book, where it is shown, that Christ

vicit contrariam potestatem, manifestatur fortitudo divinae potentiae. Si enim vicit per infirmitatem, quid fecisset, si pugnasset per virtutem? Et si *infirmum Dei fortius est hominibus,* brachium Dei *quis poterit infirmare?*[12] Vere patet, quod inenarrabilis fortitudo eius, cuius tam fortis infirmitas.

in His infirmity conquered the contrary power, the fortitude of the Divine Power is manifested. For if He conquered through infirmity, what would He have done, if He had fought though virtue? And if *the weak thing of God is stronger than men,* the arm of God *who will be able to weaken it?*[12] Truly is it clear, that inexplicable [inenarrabilis] (is) the fortitude of Him, whose infirmity is so strong.

Quartum absconditum est *dulcedo divinae misericordiae,* de quo in Psalmo:[13] *Quam magna multitudo dulcedinis tuae, Domine, quam abscondisti timentibus te.* Vere abscondita et reservata timentibus dulcedo misericordiae, quia, sicut dicitur in Psalmo:[14] *Misericordia Domini ab aeterno et usque in aeternum super timentes eum, et in eis, qui sperant super misericordia eius.*

The fourth hidden thing is *the sweetness of the Divine Mercy,* of which in the Psalm (it is said):[13] *How great the multitude of Thy sweetness, Lord, which Thou has hidden away for those who fear Thee!* Truly hidden away and reserved for those who fear (Him is) the sweetness of mercy, because, as is said in the Psalm:[14] *The Mercy of the Lord (is) from eternity and unto eternity upon those who fear Him, and upon those, who hope upon His Mercy.*

Haec dulcedo manifestatur in perscrutatione quarti libri. Nam viso, qualiter Deus dimittit peccata in praesenti, et qualia[15] nostris vulneribus adhibet medicamina, et qualia in futuro dabit praemia, nobis dulcedo divinae misericordiae aperitur.

This sweetness is manifested in the thorough scrutiny of the fourth book. For having seen, how God forgives sins in the present, and what[15] medicines He applies to our wounds, and what rewards He will give in the future, there is opened for us the sweetness of the Divine Mercy.

Horum igitur absconditorum propalatio est finis libri generalis, ad quem perduci et perducere volens Magister sententiarum *perscrutatus est profunda fluviorum* praevia gratia Spiritus sancti. Ille enim est praecipuus perscrutator secretorum et profundorum, secundum quod dicitur primae ad Corinthios secundo:[16] *Spiritus omnia perscrutatur, etiam profunda Dei.* Huius spiritus caritate agitatus et luce et claritate illustratus, composuit Magister hoc opus et scrutatus est profunda fluviorum; hoc etiam spiritu adiuvante, factus est revelator absconditorum. Ispe enim est, de quo scribitur Danielis secundo:[17] *Ipse revelat profunda et abscondita: et novit in / tenebris constituta.*

Therefore the public-exhibition [propalatio] of hidden things is the general end of the book, to which the Master of the Sentences, wanting to be lead and to lead, *has thoroughly scrutinized the depths of the* previous *rivers* by the grace of the Holy Spirit. For He is the chief thorough-scrutinizer of secrets and depths, according to that which is said in the second chapter of the First (Letter) to the Corinthians:[16] *The Spirit thoroughly scrutinizes all things, even the depths of God.* Driven by the charity of this Spirit and brightened by (His) light and clarity, the Master composed this work and scrutinized the depths of rivers; with this Spirit also helping, he has become the revealer of things hidden away. For he is that very one, of whom it is written in the second chapter of Daniel:[17] *He reveals depths and things hidden away; and he knows / those things constituted in darkness.*

[1] Vers. 15. — Mox restituimus ex mss. et ed. 1 post *substantiae* verbum *est*.
[2] Vers. 14, in quo textu fide mss. et ed. 1 mutavimus *parvam* in *parvulam.* Vulgata legit *parvam* et in fine: *quis poterit tonitruum magnitudinis illius intueri?*
[3] Vers. 10. — Paulo ante substituimus ope codd. ac edd. 1, 2, 3 *Propter* loco *Pro*.
[4] Vers. 12, 20. et 21, quem textum Vat. praeter fidem mss. prosequitur addendo: *volucres quoque coeli latet.*
[5] Iob. 28, 18. — Mox Vat., repugnatibus mss. ac ed. 1, post *ita* minus recte: *quod si cognosci optatur*.
[6] Vers. 8. et 10, ubi Vulgata pro *qui* habet *et*. — Paulo post codd. cum ed. 1 rectius *igitur* loco *ergo*.
[7] Respicitur illud Prov. 8, 23.
[8] Vers. 4. — Mox codd. non consentiunt inter se; magna pars cum Vat. habet *legitur*; cod. R *hoc legitur*; cod. O *quod intelligitur*; secuti summus codd. S Y ff et ed. 1, qui habent *loquitur.*
[9] Vers. 8. 9.
[10] Substituimus auctoritate fere omnium mss. et ed. 1 *quod* pro *quo*; quae lectio maiori vi insignita esse videtur. Cod. R praecedentem propositionem sic exhibet: *Hoc enim est sacramentum absconditum, id est sacrum secretum*.
[11] Codd. I M W *autem.*
[12] Respicitur I. Cor. 1, 25. et Isai. 14, 27. — Mox Vat. *Vere igitur patet inenarrabilis eius fortitudo, cuius est tam;* elegantius vero, ut in textu reformato, cum ed. 1 codd., quorum tamen non pauci ut A B C E F O T U V W cc omittunt insuper *eius,* alii vero ut P Q S Y loco *eius* habent *est,* cod. R *fuit.*
[13] 30, 20. — Mox post *reservata* codd. P Q R addunt *est.* Dein codd. H T , transpositis verbis et addito *divinae,* legunt *divinae misericordiae dulcedo.*
[14] 102, 17. et 146, 11.
[15] Codd. A B D F M R X non ita bene *qualiter.* Mox cod. R *medicamenta* loco *medicamina;* et paulo post Vat. cum cod. cc, antiquioribus tamen mss. et ed. 1 contradicentibus, *dat* pro *dabit.*
[16] Vers. 10, ubi Vulgata post *Spiritus* addit *enim.* — Paulo infra post *scrutatus* supplevimus ex mss. et ed. 1 *est.*
[17] Vers. 22. — Mox post *lucernam* ex mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus *inquit,* quod a Vat. abest.

[1] Verse 15. — In the following sentence we have restored *is* after *substance* on the basis of the manuscripts and edition 1.
[2] Verse 14: trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, we have changed *small* into *tiny,*. The Vulgate reads *small* here and at the end has: *who will be able to gaze at the thunder of His magnitude?*
[3] Verse 10. — A little before we have substituted with the help of the codices and editions 1, 2, and 3 *On account of* in place of *For*.
[4] Verse 12, 20 and 21, following which text the Vatican edition, departing from the other manuscripts, adds: *and the birds of heaven He also hides.*
[5] Job. 28, 18. — Then The Vatican edition, opposing the manuscripts and edition 1, in place of *thus, for her to be known* has less correctly: *so that if she chooses to be known.*
[6] Verse 8 and 10, where the Vulgate has *and* for *who.* — A little after this the codices with edition 1 have more rightly *therefore* [igitur] in place of *therefore* [ergo].
[7] This refers to Prov. 8:23.
[8] Verse 4. — Then the codices do not agree among themselves; the majority along with the Vatican edition has *this is read*; codex R has *This is said* ; codex O has *which is understood*; we have followed codices S Y ff and edition 1, which have *This is said*.
[9] Verse 8.9.
[10] We have substituted on the authority of nearly all the manuscripts and edition 1, *because* for *by which*; which reading seems to be more to the point. Codex R quotes the preceding sentence thus: *For this is the sacrament hidden away, that is the sacred secret.*
[11] Codices I M W have *Moreover.*
[12] This refers to 1 Cor. 1:25 and to Isaiah 14:27. — Then the Vatican edition has *Therefore truly is His inexplicable fortitude revealed, whose . . .*; which is indeed more elegant, as in the text reconstructed, with edition 1 the codices, which are nevertheless not a few, that is A B C E F O T U V W cc, omit in addition *His,* others indeed, that is P Q S Y, have *is* in place of *His,* codex R has instead *was.*
[13] Psalm 30:20. — Then after *reserved* codices P Q R add *is* [which the trans. has followed for greater clarity] Then codices H and T, having transposed the words and added *Divine,* read *the sweetness of the Divine Mercy.*
[14] Psalm 102:17 and 146:11.
[15] Codices A B D F M R X have not so well *in what way.* Then codex R has *medicines* [medicamenta] in place of *medicines* [medicamina]; and a little after the Vatican edition with codex cc, contradicting however the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, has *He gives* for *He will give.*
[16] Verse 10, where the Vulgate adds *For* before *The Spirit.* — A little below this we have supplied *est* after *scrutatus* on the basis of the manuscripts and edition 1 [which does not change the reading of *scrutinized*].
[17] Verse 22. — Then after *Desiring* we have inserted *he said* on the basis of the manuscripts and edition 1, which is absent in the Vatican edition. [v. page 6 here for this footnote.]

tenebris constituta. Et haec fuit intentio et finis Magistri, secundum quod ipse dicit in Prologo: «Lucernam, inquit, veritatis in candelabro exaltare volentes, in sudore ac labore multo hoc volumen, Deo praestante, compegimus ex testimoniis veritatis in aeternum fundatis». Et paulo ante dixerat, quod propositum suum est «theologicarum inquisitionum abdita pandere».

constituted in darkness. And this was the intention and purpose [finis] of the Master, according to what he himself says in the Prologue: "Desiring, he said, to exalt a light of truth upon a candlestick, we have compiled this volume in sweat and much labor, with God as our witness, from the testimonies of truth founded upon eternity." And a little before this he had said, that his proposal is "to lay open the concealed things of theological inquiries".

Patet igitur in verbo proposito praesentis libri causa materialis, formalis, efficiens et finalis.

Therefore it is clear in the word proposed (from Job) in the present book, (that) the material, formal, efficient and final cause (are hinted at).

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba & Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

PROEMIUM IN LIBRUM PRIMUM SENTENTIARUM

QUAESTIONES PROEMII

Quaestio I.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp.6-9.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

FOREWORD TO THE FIRST BOOK OF THE SENTENCES

QUESTIONS ON THE FOREWORD

Question 1

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 6-9.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUAESTIONES PROEMII

QUESTIONS ON THE FOREWORD

Ad intelligentiam eorum quae primo tacta sunt,[1] quatuor possunt quaeri iuxta quatuor praedicta.

Primo,[2] quae sit huius libri materia vel subiectum.

For an understanding of those things which were first touched upon,[1] four things can be asked in accord with the four aforesaid things.

First,[2] what is the matter and/or subject of this Book.

QUAESTIO I.

Quae sit materia quodve subiectum huius libri vel theologiae.

QUESTION 1

What is the matter or subject of this Book and/or of theology?

Et[3] quod *Deus* sit subiectum, videtur.

And[3] that it seems that *God* is the subject:

1. Illud enim subiectum est in scientia, de quo et de cuius proprietatibus est scientia tota;[4] sed de Deo et eius operibus, utpote creatione et reparatione, est totus iste liber; ergo etc.

1. For in a science, that is the subject, concerning which and concerning whose properties the whole science is;[4] but that whole Book concerns God and His works, in [utpote] the Creation and the Reparation; therefore etc..

2. Item, videtur quod subiectum istius libri sint *res et signa*. Illud enim est subiectum in scientia, secundum cuius divisionem dividitur illa scientia, quia « scientiae secantur in res »[5], hoc est, dividuntur secundum divisionem subiectorum; sed hoc est res et signum, sicut manifestum est; ergo etc.

2. Likewise, it seems that the subject of that book is *things and signs*. For in a science that is the subject, according to which division that science is divided, because « sciences are cut into things » [5], that is, they are divided according to the division of their subjects; but this is thing and sign, as has been manifested; therefore etc..

3. Item, videtur quod *credibile* sit subiectum huius libri. Illud enim est subiectum in libro, circa quod versatur auctoris intentio et tractatus; sed credibile est huiusmodi. Unde Magister dicit in Prologo quod propositum suum est, « fidem nostram clypeis Davidicae turris munire », hoc est, ad probandum fidem rationes adducere, non, in quam, *fidem-habitum*, sed *creditum*[6]: ergo etc.

3. Likewise, it seems that the *credible* is the subject of this Book. For in a book that is the subject, about which the intention of the author turns and treats; but the credible is of this kind. Whence the Master says in his Prologue that his proposal is, « to wall our faith with the round-shields of the Tower of David », that is, to adduce reasons to prove faith, not, as [in quam] *faith-habit*, but as *believed*.[6]

Sed contra: 1. Subiectum in scientia debet complecti omne, quod determinatur in illa; sed in hoc libro non tantum determinatur de Deo, sed etiam de creaturis: ergo Deus non est subiectum totius istius[7] libri generaliter, sed solum primi libri.

But on the contrary: 1. The subject in a science ought to embrace everything, which is determined in it; but in this Book there is determined not only (the things) concerning God, but also (those) concerning creatures: therefore God is not the whole subject of that[7] Book, but only of the First Book.

2. Item, aliter ostenditur illud idem sic. Licet tres causae coincidant in unam, tamen

2. Likewise, the same thing is shown in another way thus. Though three causes

materia non coincidit simul cum fine; [8] quia materia dicit quid incompletum, finis autem dicit totius operis complementum; sed Deus est finis totius istius operis, quia finis totius theologiae: ergo non est subiectum vel materia.

coincide in one, nevertheless matter does not coincide at the same time with its end;[8] because "matter" means "what is incomplete", but "end" means "complement of the work"; but God is the end of that whole work, because (He is) the end of the whole of theology: therefore He is not its subject and/or matter.

3. Item, quod *res et signa* non sint subiectum,[9] videtur. Omnis enim scientia est de rebus vel de signis: ergo si res et signa sunt subiectum huius libri, liber iste est generalis ad omnes. Quodsi[10] specialis scientia et doctrina traditur in hoc libro, patet quod res et signa non debent assignari in eo pro subiecto.

3. Likewise, it seems that *things and signs* are not the subject.[9] For every science concerns things and/or signs: therefore if things and signs are the subject of this Book, that Book is general for all. And if[10] a special science and doctrine is handed down in this Book, it is clear that things and signs ought not to be assigned in it for its subject.

4. Item, constat quod alia est scientia de rebus et alia de signis, ut patet; differt enim sermocinalis scientiae a naturali; ergo scientia tradita in hoc libro aut[11] non est unius generis, aut non est simul de rebus et de signis; sed est unius generis: ergo etc.

4. Likewise, it is agreed that one is the science of things and another that of signs, as it clear; for conversational science differs from natural science; therefore the science handed down in this Book either[11] is not of one genus, or is not at the same time of things and of signs; but it is of one genus: therefore etc..

5. Item, quod *credibile* non sit subiectum, videtur, quia scientia et virtus[12] sunt diversi habitus: ergo habent diversa obiecta; ergo cum credibile, in quantum huiusmodi, si obiectum virtutis, non erit obiectum scientiae in quantum huiusmodi: ergo etc.

5. Likewise, it seems that the *credible* is not the subject, because science and virtue[12] are diverse habits: therefore they have diverse objects; therefore since the credible qua credible [in quantum huiusmodi], if it be the object of a virtue, will not be the object of the science qua science: therefore etc..

6. Item, sicut consideratio huius libri versatur / circa fidem,

6. Likewise, as the consideration of this Book revolves / around faith,

[1] Hoc est: quae in Prooemio generaliter de quatuor causis libri sententiarum dicta sunt. Nunc quatuor quaestiones speciales de eisdem causis proponuntur.
[2] Codd. F bb cum ed. 1 addunt hic *quaeritur*.
[3] Restituimus ex mss. et ed. 1 particulam *Et*. Mox post verbum *videtur* cod. M adiungit *Probo*.
[4] Vide Aristot., I Poster. c.7. et 8. — Mox sequimur codd. et ed. 1 ponendo *et* pro *de* ac dein *utpote* loco *ut puta*. Codd. F et S *operationibus* pro *operibus*.
[5] Aristot., III. de Anima, text. 38. (in ed. Paris. Firmin-Didot c. 8), ubi sic habetur: Secatur igitur scientia et sensus in res. Cum quibus verbis concordant antiquiores codd. et ed. 1 contra Vat. ac recentiorem cod. cc, qui habet *ut res* pro *in res*. Paulo ante Vat. post *scientia* addit *ab aliis*; sed mendose (agitur siquidem de divisione scientiae *in se*, uti ex subnexis colligitur) et praeter fidem mss. ac ed. 1. Mox Vat. cum cod. cc, refragantibus tamen antiquiores mss.

[1] That is: what is generally said in the Foreword concerning the four causes of the Book of the Sentences. Now four special questions concerning the same causes are proposed.
[2] Codices F and bb with edition 1 add here *it is asked*.
[3] We have restored from the manuscripts and edition 1 the conjunction *And*. Just before the word *that* codex M adjoins *I prove*.
[4] See Aristotle, Posterior Analytics, Bk. I, ch. 7 & 8. — Then we follow the codices and edition 1 by placing *and* in place of *of* and then *in* [utpote] in place of *considered as*. Codices F and S have *operations* in place of *works*.
[5] Aristotle, De Anima, Bk. III, text. 38 (in the Parisian edition of Firmin-Didot ch. 8), where it is had thus: Therefore science and sense is cut into things. With which words the more ancient codices and edition 1

ed ed. 1, ante *dividuntur* repetit particulam *quia*, sed male, eo quod proxime subnexa non sint nisi explicatio verborum *secantur in res*. Paulo post sub demonstrativo *hoc* intellige tale subiectum, secundum cuius divisionem dividitur theologia. Substituimus ex codd. A G H I M Y etc. et ed. 1. *hoc* pro *haec*, licet multi codd. cum Vat. habeant *haec*, quia in eorum lectione syllogismus perturbaretur.
[6] Sensus est: non, in quam, fidem in quantum est habitus a Deo in animam infusus, sed in quantum est ipsum creditum, scil. veritates revelatae; sive aliis verbis, si recte tamen intelligantur: non fidem subiective, sed obiective sumtam. — Vat. *sed fide creditum*; edd. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 legunt: *fidem creditum secundum habitum, sed secundum creditum* ; omnes vero codd. cum ed. 1 exhibent testum nostrum.
[7] Vat. cum cod. recentiori cc *huius* contra antiquiores mss. et ed. 1.
[8] Aristot., II. Phys. text. 70. (ed Paris. Firmin-Didot. c. 7.), ubi sic legitur: Veniunt autem tres (causae) in unam plerumque.
[9] Cod. V *materia seu subiectum*. Mox post *vel* restituimus ex fere omnibus mss. et ed. 1 omissam particulam *de*.
[10] Lectio Vat., quae est et multorum codd., explicatur per sequentem cod. L: *Sed constat quod specialis*; codd. A C F R aa *Sed specialis*; cod. G *Sed si specialis*. Mox codd. S U ff post *patet* adiiciunt *igitur*. Deinde fide mss. et ed. 1 posuimus *debent* pro *habent*.
[11] Vat. cum recentiori cod. cc vitiose et contra antiquiores mss. ac ed. 1 particulam *aut* transponit post *ergo*. Mox cod. V verbo *generis* adiungit *determinati*.
[12] Mendum Vat. *veritas* loco *virtus* et paulo infra *veritatis* pro *virtutis* castigavimus auctoritate mss. et ed.1.

concord against the Vatican text and the more recent codex cc, which has *as things* in place of *into things*. A little before this the Vatican text adds *from others* after *science*; but faultily (if it indeed deals with the division of a science *in itself*, as is gathered from the points that follow) and unsupported by the manuscripts and edition 1. Then the Vatican text with codex cc, in opposition however to the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, repeats the conjunction *because* after *is divided*, but badly, for the reason that the points that follow most closely are not but an explanation of the words *are cut into things*. A little after this by the demonstrative *this* understand "such a subject, according to the division of which theology is divided". We have substituted from codices A G H I M Y etc. and edition 1. *this* [hoc] in place of *this* [haec], though many codices together with the Vatican manuscript have the latter, because in their reading the syllogism is confused.
[6] The sense is: "not, as [in quam], faith inasmuch as it is a habit infused into the soul by God, but inasmuch as it is the very thing believed, namely revealed truths; or in other words, if however they are rightly understood: faith taken not subjectively, but objectively. — The Vatican text has *but believed by faith*; editions 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 read: *faith believed according to habit, but according to what is believed*; but all codices with edition 1 exhibit our text.
[7] The Vatican text with the more recent codex cc has *of this* in contradiction to the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1.
[8] Aristotle, Physics, Bk. II, text. 70. (in the Parisian edition of Firmin-Didot. ch. 7), where it read thus: "Moreover three (causes) come into one, for the most part". [9] Codex V has *matter or subject*. Then after *and/or* we have restored from nearly all the manuscripts and edition 1 the omitted word *concerns* [de].
[10] The reading of the Vatican text, which is also that of many codices, is explained by the following codex L: *But it is agreed that a special*; codices A C F R and aa have *But a special*; codex G has *But if a special*. Then codices S U and ff add *therefore* after *it is clear*. Next trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1 we have put *ought not* in place of *do not have*.
[11] The Vatican text together with the more recent codex cc wrongly and against the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 transposes the conjunction *either* after *therefore*. Then codex V adjoins *determined* to the word *of a kind*.
[12] The mistake of the Vatican text of having *truth* in place of *virtue* and a little below this *of truth* in place of *of virtue* we have corrected on the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1.

---

p. 7

circa fidem, ita etiam[1] circa spem et caritatem: ergo si sperandum vel diligendum sive diligible non est subiectum huius libri, pari ratione nec credibile est subiectum in eo.

around faith, so also[1] around hope and charity: therefore if what is to be hoped and/or loved or what is lovable is not the subject of this Book, for equal reason neither is the credible the subject in it.

CONCLUSIO.

CONCLUSION

Deus est subiectum theologiae radicale, Christus est subiectum integrale, res et signa sunt subiectum universale sive etiam credibile, prout transit in rationem intelligibilis.

God is the radical subject of theology, Christ is the integral subject, things and signs are the universal subject or even the credible one, insofar as [prout] *it passes into the reckoning of the intelligible.*

R**ESPONDEO:** Dicendum, quod subiectum in aliqua scientia vel doctrina tripliciter potest accipi. Uno modo dicitur subiectum in scientia,[2] ad quod omnia reducuntur sicut ad *principium radicale*; alio modo, ad quod omnia reducuntur sicut ad *totum integrale*; tertio modo, ad quod omnia reducuntur sicut as *totum universale*.

I **RESPOND:** It must be said, that the subject in any science and/or doctrine can be interpreted in a threefold manner. In one manner a subject in a science is said (to be) that,[2] to which all things are reduced as to their *radical principle*; in another manner, that to which all things are reduced as to their *integral whole*; in a third manner, that to which all things are reduced as to their *universal whole*.

Exemplum huius manifeste patet in *grammatica*. Nam subiectum primo modo, ad quod omnia reducuntur sicut ad principium elementare[3] vel radicale, est littera, quam ideo vocat Priscianus[4] *elementum*, quia est minimum, in quo stat resolutio grammatici. Subiectum, ad quod omnia reducuntur sicut ad totum integrale, est oratio congrua et perfecta. Subiectum vero, ad quod omnia reducuntur sicut ad totum universale, est vox litterata, articulata[5] ordinabilis ad significandum aliquid in se vel in alio.

An example of this is manifestly clear in *grammar*. For in the first manner the subject, to which all things are reduced as to their elementary or radical principle,[3] is the letter, which for that reason Priscian[4] calls *the element*, because it is the smallest thing, upon which the resolution of grammatical (structure) depends [in quo ... stat]. The subject, to which all things are reduced as to their integral whole, is congruous and perfect speaking. But the subject, to which all things are reduced as to their universal whole, is the voice literate, articulate[5] and able to be ordained to signify anything in itself and/or in another.

Per hunc modum est distinguere in *quadrivialibus*. Nam subiectum in geometria, ad quod omnia resolvuntur[6] ut ad principium, est punctus. Subiectum, ad quod omnia reducuntur ut ad totum integrum, est corpus, quod continet in se omne genus dimensionis. Subiectum, ad quod omnia reducuntur ut ad totum universale, est quantitas continua, immobilis.

By this means one can [est] distinguish among *the quadrivium*. For the subject in geometry, to which all things are resolved[6] as to their principle, is the point. The subject, to which all things are reduced as to their integral whole, is the body, which contains in itself every genus of dimension. The subject, to which all things are reduced as to their universal whole, is continuous, immovable quantity.

Per hunc modum et in hoc libro est assignare subiectum secundum triplicem differentiam.

By this means one can also assign, in this Book, a subject according to a threefold difference.

Nam subiectum, ad quod omnia[7] reducuntur ut ad *principium*, est ipse *Deus*.

For the subject, to which all things[7] are reduced as to their *principle*, is *God* Himself.

Subiectum quoque, ad quod omnia

Also the subject, to which all things are

reducuntur, quae determinantur in hoc libro, ut ad *totum integrum*, est *Christus*, prout comprehendit naturam divinam et humanum sive creatum et increatum,[8] de quibus sunt duo primi libri; et caput et membra, de quibus sunt duo sequentes. Et accipio large[9] *totum integrum*, quod multa complectitur non solum per compositionem, sed per unionem et per ordinem.

reduced, which is determined in this Book, as to their *entire whole*, is *Christ*, insofar He comprehends the Divine Nature and the human or the created and the uncreated,[8] of which are the first two books; and as Head and members, of which are the two following. And I interpret broadly[9] *the entire whole*, as that which embraces many things not only through composition, but through union and through order.

Subiectum quoque, ad quod omnia reducuntur sicut ad *totum universale*, possumus nominare per circumlocutionem[10] sive sub disiunctione; et sic est res vel signum; et vocatur hic *signum* Sacramentum. Possumus et unico vocabulo nominare; et sic est *credibile*, prout tamen credibile transit in rationem modo, proprie loquendo, est[11] subiectum in hoc libro.

Also the subject, to which all things are reduced as to their *universal whole*, we can name through a circumlocution[10] or under a disjunction; and thus it is thing and/or sign; and this *sign* is called the Sacrament. We can also name it with one word; and thus it is the *credible*, however insofar as the credible does pass into the reason in a (certain) manner, properly speaking, it is[11] the subject in this Book.

Concedendae ergo sunt rationes probantes, et *Deum* esse subiectum et *res* et *signa*, et *credibile*, diversimode, sicut dictum est.

Therefore (these) proving reasons must be conceded, and that *God*, and *things* and *signs*, and the *credible*, in diverse ways, are the subject, as has been said.

1. Quod ergo obiicitur in contrarium, quod non tantum de Deo[12] agitur in hoc libro; dicendum,

1. Therefore that it is objected in the Contrary, that not only what concerns God[12] is dealt with in this book; it must be said . . .

---

[1] In Vat. et recentiori cod. cc non bene deest *etiam*, quod tamen in antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 habetur. Mox cod. F *sicut* pro *si*. Deinde fide omnium codd. et ed. 1 expunximus *sperabile vel*, quod Vat. praemitti verbo *diligibile*.
[2] Cod. U hic satis bene addit *illud*. Mox, postulantibus fere omnibus mss. et ed 1, substituimus *alio* pro *secundo*.
[3] Vat. *primum elementale*. Auctoritate codd. ee ff et ed. 1 in textum recepimus *pincipium*, utpote quod praecedentibus et subsequentibus magis correspondere videtur; multi codd. propter abbreviationem ambigui sunt; omnes tamen cum ed. 1 legunt *elementare*.
[4] Libr. I Grammat. c. 2 (de Littera). — Non multo post cod. X *grammaticae* pro *grammatici*.
[5] Explicationem horum verborum accipe a Prisciano, I. Grammat. c. 1: Articulata est, quae coarctata, hoc est, copulata cum aliquo sensu mentis eius, qui loquitur, profertur . . . Litterata est, quae scribi potest. — Unus alterve cod. ut aa haec duo adiectiva coniungit per particulam *et*.
[6] Codd. H I K *reducuntur*. Mox post *principium* codd. P Q X ff addunt, ut et supra in textu additum est, *radicale*. Paulo post codd. H Q *integrale* pro *integrum*.

[1] In the Vatican text and the more recent codex cc *also* is lacking, which is had, however, in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1. Then codex F has *as* in place of *if*. Next trusting in all the codices and edition 1. we have expunged *believable and/or*, which the Vatican text prefaces with the word *lovable*.
[2] Codex U well enough adds here *that* [trans. which the English translation has followed for greater clarity]. Then, applying nearly all the manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *another* in place of *a second*.
[3]
The Vatican text has *the first elementary*. On the authority of codices ee ff and edition 1 we have received as the text *principle*, in that it seems to correspond more to the preceding and subsequent (sentences); many codices on account of abbreviation are ambiguous (here); all however together with edition 1 read *elementary*.
[4] Grammar, Bk I, ch. 2 (On the Letter). — Not much after this codex X has *of grammar* in place of *of grammatical (structure)*.
[5] The explanation of these words comes from Priscian, Grammar, Bk. I, ch. 1: "That has been articulated, which has been compressed, that is,

[7] Cod. D hic addit, sicuti et paulo post in textu reperitur, *quae determinantur in hoc libro*; codd. vero D K post *principium* adiiciunt *radicale vel initiale* et cod. ff tantum *radicale*, quae adiectiva cum praecendentibus correspondent textumque distinctiorem reddunt. Paulo post codd. K Q *integrale* loco *integrum*.
[8] Lectio Vat. *sive creatam et increatam*, quae nimis arcta videtur, castigatur auctoritate mss. et ed. 1.
[9] Consulto dicit *large*, quia *totum integrum* in sensu stricto dicit compositum ex partibus; sed dua naturae in Christo faciunt totum integrum secundum Scholasticos per unionem hypostaticam, non per strictam compositionem. — Vat. praemittit particulam *hic* et mox post *sed* addit *etiam*, quod hic et alibi saepius omnes mss. omittunt, licet minus congrue.
[10] Contra auctoritatem codd. et ed. 1 loco *per circumlocutionem* Vat. ponit *dupla nominatione*, fortasse propter maiorem oppositionem cum verbis paulo post sequentibus *unico vocabulo*.
[11] Praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 repetit hic Vat. *credibile*, quod certe in textu subintelligendum est. Mox codd. P Q cum edd. 4 et 5 post *diversimode* satis bene addunt *tamen*.
[12] Vat. *quod de Deo non agitur per totum in hoc libro*; mss. cum ed. 1 contra Vat. in eo conveniunt, quod omittant *per totum*; codd. vero R T ee ff et ed. 1, transpositis verbis et addendo *tantum*, suppeditant lectionem, quam in textum recepimus, quae et in se clarior est et ad amussim correspondet propositioni minori supra in obiectione positae. Mox post *tamen* ex codd. T et ee supplevimus *de Deo*, quae verba certe subaudienda sunt. Dein cod. F post *substantiam* addit *et operationem*. Plures codd. ex repetitione vocis *substantiam* decepti propositionem mutile exhibent. Cod. K vero totam responsionem magis succincte ita proponit: *Quod ergo obiicitur in contrarium, quod Deus non complectitur omnia, quae hic considerantur, dicendum, quod ex hoc non sequitur, quod Deus non sit subiectum in hac scientia, sed tantum* (sic primitus, postea correctum in *tamen*) *sequitur, quod non est subiectum / ut totum, sed ut principium.*

joined together with another sense of the mind of him, who is speaking, mentioning . . . That is literate [litterata], which can be written." — One or the other codex like aa conjoins these two adjectives by the conjunction *and*.
[6] Codices H I and K have *are reduced*. Then after *principle*, codices P Q X and ff add, as has also been added above in the text, *radical*. A little after this codices H and Q have *integral* in place of *entire* [integrum].
[7] Here codex D adds, as is also a little afterwards repeated in the text, *which are determined in this Book*; but codices D and K add *radical and/or initial* after *principle* and codex ff adds *radical* only, which adjectives correspond with the preceding ones and render the text more distinct. A little after this codices K and Q have *integral* in place of *entire* [integrum].
[8] The reading of the Vatican text *or created and uncreated*, which seems exceedingly brief, is corrected on the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1.
[9] He says *broadly* deliberately, because he says that *the entire whole* in the strict sense has been composed out of parts; but the two natures in Christ make an entire whole according to the Scholastics through the hypostatic union, not through strict composition. — The Vatican text prefaces this with the adverb *here* and then adds *also* after *but*, which here and elsewhere all the manuscripts often omit, though less fittingly.
[10] Against the authority of the codices and edition 1 in place of *through a circumlocution* the Vatican text puts *by a twofold naming*, perhaps on account of the greater opposition with the words which follow a little after this: *with one word*.
[11] Against the testimony of the manuscripts and edition 1 the Vatican text here repeats *credible*, which certainly must be understood (as being) implicitly in the text. Then codices P and Q together with editions 4 and 5 add well enough *however* after *in diverse manners*.
[12] The Vatican text has *that what concerns God is not dealt with entirely* [per totum] *in this Book*; the manuscripts together with edition 1 agree against the Vatican text in this, that they omit *entirely*; but codices R T ee ff and edition 1, with transposed words and by adding *only*, supply the reading, which we have received into the text, which is also in itself clearer and corresponds to the structure [ad amussim] of the minor proposition placed above in the objections. [Trans. note: what follows refers to the text on page 8] Then after *however* we have supplied *what concerns God* from codices T and ee, which words certainly have to be understood. Next codex F adds *and operation* after *substance*. Very many codices, deceived from the repetition of *substance* exhibit a mutilated proposition. But codex K proposes the whole response more succinctly in this manner: *Therefore that it is objected in the Contrary, that God does not embrace all things, which are here considered, it must be said, that from this it does not follow, that God is not the subject in this science, but it only* (thus the reading of the

primitive text, afterwards corrected to *however*) *follows, that He is not the subject / as the whole, but as the principle.*

p. 8

quod, quamvis non agatur de Deo quantum ad substantiam tantum, agitur tamen de Deo quantum ad substantiam, vel quantum ad opera eius; et ideo non est subiectum ut totum, sed ut principium.

that, although what concerns God is not dealt with only as much as regards His substance, however what concerns God is dealt with as much as regards His substance, and/or as much as regards His works; and for that reason He is not the subject as the whole, but as the principle.

2. Quod obiicitur, quod materia non coincidit in unum cum fine; dicendum, quod materia tripliciter dicitur: scilicet materia *ex qua*, materia *in qua* et materia *circa quam*; et haec ultima materia magis[1] dicitur obiectum quam materia. Quando ergo dicitur, quod materia non coincidit cum fine, verum est de materia *ex qua*, quae proprie est materia,[2] sed non de materia *circa quam*, quae proprie est obiectum; nam idem potest esse obiectum habitus et finis; et tali modo accipitur materia in scientia pro obiecto virtutis[3] cognoscentis.

2. That it is objected, that matter does not coincide in one thing with its end; it must be said, that matter is spoken of in a threefold manner: namely matter *out of which*, matter *in which* and matter *about which*; and this last matter is called object rather[1] than matter. Therefore when it is said, that matter does not coincide with its end, it is true of matter *out of which*, which properly is the matter[2] but not of the matter *about which*, which properly is the object; for the same thing can be object, habit and end; and in such a manner "matter" is interpreted in science as the object of the virtue[3] of the one becoming acquainted with it.

3. 4. Quod obiicitur de *rebus* et *signis*, quod sunt subiecta omnium scientiarum; dicendum, quod res et signum[4] possunt accipi *in sua generalitate*; et sic non pertinent ad scientiam specialem nec ad librum nec ad eandem scientiam. Possunt iterum accipi secundum quod induunt rationem *credibilis*, et sic, quemadmodum una est *virtus*[5] et unus est habitus de omnibus credibilibus, sive sint res sive sint signa, ut fides, sic una est *scientia* specialis de omnibus, in quantum induunt hanc rationem,[6] sive sint res sive signa.

3. 4. That there is an objection concerning *things* and *signs*, because they are the subjects of all sciences; it must be said, that thing and sign[4] can be interpreted *in their generality*; and so they do not pertain to a special science nor to the Book nor to the same science. Again they can be interpreted according to which they put on a reckoning *of the credible*, and so, in accord with the manner that there is one *virtue*[5] and one habit concerning all credibles, whether they be things or signs, as is faith, so there is one special *science* concerning all things, inasmuch as they put on that reckoning,[6] whether they be things or signs.

Aliter potest dici, quod dupliciter est loqui de rebus et signis, aut *absolute*, aut in relatione ad fruitionem sive ad illud, quo fruendum est. Primo quidem modo spectant ad speciales scientias et diversas; secundo modo ad unam scientiam sive doctrinam.

In another manner it can be said, that there is a twofold manner of speaking [dupliciter est loqui] concerning things and signs, either *absolutely*, or in *relation* to enjoyment or to that, by which a thing is to be enjoyed. Indeed in the first manner they

Unde quemadmodum de omnibus entibus, in quantum reducuntur ad unum primum ens, est una scientia et[7] unus liber, sic de omnibus rebus et signis, in quantum reducuntur ad unum, quod est alpha et omega, est una scientia.

look towards the special and diverse sciences; in the second manner towards one science or doctrine. Whence in accord with the manner which concerns all beings, inasmuch as they are reduced to one Prime Being, there is one science and[7] one Book, so concerning all things and signs, inasmuch as they are reduced to one thing, which is their alpha and omega, there is one science.

5. 6. Quod obiicitur, quod *credibile* est obiectum virtutis[8] etc.; dicendum, quod alio modo est credibile obiectum virtutis, alio modo scientiae. Credibile enim, secundum quod habet in se rationem *primae veritatis*, cui fides assentit propter se et super omnia, pertinet ad habitum fidei; secundum quod super rationem veritatis addit rationem *auctoritatis*, pertinet ad doctrinam sacrae Scripturae, de qua dicit Augustinus super Genesim ad litteram,[9] quod « maior est eius auctoritatis quam humani ingenii perspicacitas »; sed secundum quod supra rationem veritatis et auctoritatis addit rationem *probabilitatis*, pertinet ad considerationem presentis libri, in quo ponuntur rationes probantes fidem nostram. Et sic patet, quomodo differenter est *fides* de credibili, et *libri* de canone sacrae Scripturae, et *praesens scriptura*. Et ideo non valet illa[10] obiectio, quoniam iste liber non est sic ad defensionem spei et caritatis, sicut fidei; et ideo non est simile.

5. 6. That it is objected, that the *credible* is the object of virtue[8] etc.; it must be said, that in one manner the credible is the object of virtue, in another of science. For the credible, according to which it has in itself a reckoning *of prime truth*, to which faith assents on account of itself and above all things, pertains to the habit of faith; according to which it adds ,above the reckoning of truth, the reckoning *of authority*, it pertains to the doctrine of Sacred Scripture, of which Augustine says in his Literal Exposition of Genesis,[9] that « greater perspicacity belongs to its authority than to human ingenuity »; but according to which it adds above the reckoning of truth and authority, a reckoning *of probability*, it pertains to the consideration of the present book, in which there are posited reasons to prove our faith. And so it is clear, how different *faith* is from the credible, and *books* from the canon of Sacred Scripture, even *the present writing*. And for that reason that[10] objection is not valid, since that Book is not so much for the defense of hope and charity, as it is of faith; and for that reason it is not similar.

SCHOLION.

I. Supponit Doctor Seraphicus in his quaestionibus prooemialibus et alibi passim, quod theologia sit vera scientia; immo in Breviloq. p. I. c. 1. dicit: Ipsa sola est scientiae perfecta. Quo sensu hoc dicatur, explicatur III. Sent. d. 23. a. 1. q. 1. ad 4, et ibid. q. 4. — Scotus (Prolog. q. 4.) cum Nominalibus negat, theologiam in viatoribus esse *proprie* scientiam; S. Thomas (S. I. q. 1. a. 2.) vero hoc affirmat.

SCHOLIUM

I. The Seraphic Doctor supposes in these questions on the foreword and elsewhere passim, that theology is a true science; nay rather in the Breviloquium, part I, ch. 1. he says: It alone is the perfect science. In what sense this is said, is explained in Sent., Bk. III, d. 23, a. 1, q.1 at n. 4, and ibid. q. 4. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus (Prolog., q. 4) together with the Nominalists denies, that theology in wayfarers is *properly* a science; but St. Thomas (Summa., I, q. 1, a. 2) affirms it.

II. Non quaeritur hic de subiecto, *in quo* est scientia, quod est intellectus, sed de subiecto, *de quo* est scientia et *circa* quod immediate versatur. Dicitur *subiectum*, quia de illo ea praedicantur, de quibus agitur in illa scientia. Licet ab auctoribus non raro hi termini: *subiectum, obiectum* et *materia circa quam*, confundantur, tamen in sensu stricto obiectum scientiae est id *quod* scitur, subiectum vero eius est id *de quo* conclusiones praedicantur. S. Doctor accipit hic subiectum in sense stricto.

II. This is not asked concerning the subject, *in which* there is science, which is the intellect, but concerning the subject *from which* science is and *about* which it immediately revolves. It is called a *subject*, because things are predicated of it, which are dealt with in that science. Though not rarely are these terms: *subject, object* and *matter about which*, confounded by authors, nevertheless in the strict sense the object of a science is that thing *which* is known, but its subject is that thing *from which* conclusions are predicated. The Seraphic Doctor interprets subject here in the strict sense.

III. Circa distinctionem, quam habet in solutione ad 2, hoc notandum. Materia *in qua* vocatur subiectum sive corporale sive spirituale, in quo recipitur aliquod accidens: sic intellectus dici potest materia, in qua recipitur scientia. Materia *ex qua* dicitur ea pars compositi, quae cum forma facit compositum. Materia *circa quam* dicitur in scientia ipsum subiectum, circa / quod versatur scientia.

III. About the distinction, which he has made in the solution to n. 2, this must be noted. Matter *in which* is called the subject, either corporal or spiritual, in which some accident is received: so the intellect can be said to be the matter, in which science is received. Matter *from which* is said to be that part of the thing composed, which together with the form makes the composite. Matter *about which* is said in science to be the subject itself, about / which the science revolves.

---

ut totum, sed ut principium. Mentem suam S. Doctor hac de re in Breviloq. b. I. c. 1. ita aperit: Cum s. Scriptura sive theologia sit scientia dans sufficientem notitiam de primo principio secundum statum viae ... et Deus non tantum sit rerum primum principium et exemplar effectivum in creatione, sed etiam refectivum in redemptione et perfectivum in retributione; ideo non tantum agit de Deo creatore, sed etiam de creatione (ita codd. contra edd., quae habe *creatore*) et creatura.

[1] Cod. N addit *proprie*.

[2] Cod. aa adiungit *et similiter de materia in qua*, quae lectio in textum recipienda videretur, si sufficienti numero codicum fulciretur; certe tamen ipsa subintelligenda est.

[3] Falsa lectio Vat. *veritatis* loco *virtutis* emendatur ex mss. et sex primis edd.

[4] Cod. aa satis bene *signa*. Mox codd. A T Y etc. ante *librum* non repetunt particulam *ad*, cod. I ponit *vel librum*, cod. X *nec ad librum unum*.

[5] Vat., quae falso ponit *veritas*, corrigitur ex mss. et sex primis edd.

[6] Vat. cum recentiori cod. cc superflue hic addit *scilicet credibilis*, quod dees in antquioribus mss. et ed. 1.

[7] Ex codd. A F G H I K P R S T V Y etc. cum ed. 1 posuimus *et* loco *aut*. Deinde codd. I et T post *liber* bene addunt *scilicet metaphysica*. Mox, fere omnibus mss. et ed. 1 refragantibus, Vat. habet *ordinantur*

as the whole, but as the principle. The Seraphic Doctor explains his mind on this matter in the Breviloquium, Bk. I, ch. 1, in this manner: Since Sacred Scripture or theology is a science giving sufficient knowledge [notitiam] of the First Principle according to the state of the way . . . and since God is not only the First Principle of things and the effective Exemplar in creation, but also the refective One in redemption and the perfective One in retribution; for that reason not only does it deal with God the Creator, but also with the creation (thus the codices against the editions, which have *creator*) and the creature.

[1] Codex N adds *properly*.

[2] Codex aa adjoins *and similarly concerning matter in which*, which reading seems must be received into the text, if it is supported by a sufficient number of codices; nevertheless it certainly must be understood as implicit.

[3] The false reading of the Vatican text, which has *of truth* in place of *of virtue*, is emended from the manuscripts and from the six first editions.

[4] Codex as has *signs* well enough. Then codices A T Y etc. do not repeat the preposition *to* before *Book*, codex I puts *and/or the Book*, codex X has *nor to a book*.

[5] The Vatican text, which falsely puts *truth*, is corrected from the manuscripts and the six first editions.

pro *reducuntur*; cod. vero bb *reducuntur vel ordinantur*.
[8] Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1 in hac propositione bis habet mendose *veritatis* loco *virtutis*.
[9] Libr. II. c. 5: Maior est quippe Scripturae huius auctoritas quam omnis humani ingenii capacitas. — Dein Vat. praeter fidem codd. voci *secundum* praemitti *sed*; ed. 1 addit *vero*.
[10] Magis placeret, si pro *illa* haberetur *alia*. Vat. autem absque ulla mss. auctoritate post *obiectio* adiungit *de sperabili vel diligibili*. Circa finem propositionis codd. inter se non conveniunt; Vat. cum cod. cc pro *et ideo* habet *unde*; multi codd. ut A C F G S V W X bb etc. nullam coniunctivam particulam ponunt; cod. D *nec* pro *et ideo non*; codd. autem B D K Q R exhibent lectionem nostram *et ideo*; codd. I T *ideo*.

[6] The Vatican text together with the more recent codex cc adds superfluously here *namely the credible*, which is lacking in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1.
[7] From codices A F G H I K P R S T V Y etc. together with edition 1, we have put *and* in place of *or*. Then codices I and T after *book* do well to add *namely metaphysics*. Next, opposing nearly all the manuscripts and edition 1, the Vatican text has *are ordered* in place of *are reduced*; but codex bb has *are reduced and/or ordered*.
[8] The Vatican text, against the manuscripts and edition 1, twice in this proposition has faultily *of the truth* in place of *of virtue*.
[9] Book II, ch. 5: "Indeed greater is the authority of this Scripture than the capacity of all human ingenuity." — Then the Vatican text, not trusting in the codices prefaces *but* [sed] to the word *according*; edition 1 adds *but* [vero].
[10] It would be more pleasing, if it had *the other* in place of *that*. Moreover the Vatican text without any authority from the manuscripts adjoins *concerning the hopeable and/or lovable* after *objection*. Near the end of the proposition the codices do not agree among themselves; the Vatican text with codex cc has *whence* in place of *and for that reason*; many codices such as A C F G S V W X bb etc place no conjunction at this point; codex D has *neither* in place of *and for that reason . . . not*; but codices B D K Q R exhibit our reading *and for that reason*; codices I and T have instead *for that reason*.

---

quod versatur scientia. Haec ultima sub diverso respectu potest esse tum *obiectum* habitus tum *finis*, ut patet in virtutibus theologicis: v. g. fidei obiectum et finis est prima Veritas; creditur enim summum verum propter summum verum. Cfr. Alexander Hal. Sum. p. I . q. 1. m. 3.

which the science revolves. This last under diverse respects can be both *the object* of the habit and *the end*, as is clear among the theological virtues: e.g. the object and end of faith is Prime Truth; for the Most High True One is believed on account of being the Most High True One. Cf. Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 1, m. 3.

IV. In solutione ad 3. tangitur quaestio de *unitate scientiae theologicae*. Hanc Nominales ex suis falsis principiis impugnant; sed eam adstruunt S. Bonaventura, Breviloq. p. 1. c. 1. Alexander Halensis, p. I. q. 1. m. 3. ad 4. et 5. — Scotus, I. Report. Prolog. quaestiunc. 2. — S. Thomas, I. Sent. Prolog. q. 1. a. 2; Sum. I q. 1. a. 3. — B. Albertus M., Sum. p. I. tr. 1. q. 3. m. 2; I. Sent. d. 1. a. 3. — Petrus a Tranatasia, I. Sent. Prolog. a. 2. — Aegidius Romanus, I. Sent. Prolog. part. 1. principalis 2. q. 3. — Henricus Gandaviensis, Sum. a. 6.

IV. In the solution to 3. the question of *the unity of the science of theology* is touched upon. This the Nominalists impugn from their false principles; but they build next to it, as St. Bonaventure says in Breviloquium., p. 1, c. 1. Alexander of Hales, p. I, q. 1, m. 3, at nn 4 and 5. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, Reportatio, Bk. I, Prologue, quaestiunc. 2. — St. Thomas, Sent., Bk. I, Prologue, q. 1, a. 2; Summa., Bk. I, q. 1, a. 3. — Bl. (now St.) Albert the Great, Summa., p. I, tr. 1, q. 3, m. 2; Sent., Bk. I, d. 1, a. 3. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, Sent., Bk. I, Prologue. a. 2. —

q. 3. — Durandus, I. Sent. Prolog. q. 4.

Giles the Roman, Sent., Bk. I, Prologue, part. 1, principle 2, q. 3. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 6, q. 3. — Durandus, Sent., Bk. I, Prologue, q. 4.

V. In solutione principalis quaetionis antiqui scholastici valde saltem verbis dissentiunt. Nonnulli affirmant, Deum esse quidem subiectum theologiae, non autem sub ratione Deitatis, sed sub aliqua limitatione, v. g. quatenus est restaurator et glorificator (ita Aegidius R.) vel quatenus est perfectissimus (Dionys. Carth.). Haec vero limitatio ex parte subiecti non videtur probabilis. — Alexander Ha. ponit tria subiecta secundum tria, quae sunt in quolibet ente completo, scil. secundum substantiam, virtutem (potentiam) et operationem: primo modo subiectum est Deus, secundo modo est Christus, qui est virtus Patris, tertio modo sunt opera restaurationis facta per Christum. — Scoto attribuitur sententiae, Deum sub ratione entis infiniti esse subiectum theologiae; attamen cum ipse (I. Sent. Prolog. q. 3. n. 9.) dicat: Deum sub ratione entis infiniti aut necessarii non legitime poni obiectum theologiae, sententia eius a Frassenio (Scotus academicus, tom. I. disp. prooem. a. 2. q. 5.) et a Lycheto (ad loc. cit.) ita explicatur, ut in substantia cum S. Thoma conveniat, qui (S. I. q. 1. a. 7.) unum assignat subiectum, scil. Deum sub ratione Deitatis. Differentia tamen inter utrumque consistit in hoc, quod Scotus putat, hoc subiectum *Deus* intelligi *materialiter*, uti res et causa omnium veritatum, quas virtualiter in se continet; S. Thomas vero intelligit Deum in ratione *formali*, id est, ut scibilis vel revelabilis, non autem in se et subiective. De hac differentia cf. Caietanus in Comment. et Macedo (Collationes doctrinae S.Thomae et Scoti, Coll. 2 diff. 4. sect 4.).

V. In the solution of the principle question the ancient scholastics dissented strongly at least in words. Not a few affirm, that God indeed is the subject of theology, not however under the reckoning of Deity, but under some limitation, e.g. to the extent that He is the restorer and glorifier (thus Giles the Roman) and/or to the extend He is the most perfect (Bl. Denis the Carthusian). But this limitation on the part of the subject does not seem probable. — Alexander of Hales posits three subjects according to the three things, which are in any complete being [ente completo], namely according to substance, virtue (potency) and operation: in the first manner the subject is God, in the second manner it is Christ, who is the virtue of the Father, in the third manner they are the works of restoration wrought through Christ. — To Scotus is attributed the opinion, that God under the reckoning of an infinite being [entis infiniti] is the subject of theology; but nevertheless since he himself says (Sent., Bk. 1, Prolog., q. 3, n. 9.): "That God under the reckoning of an infinite or necessary being [entis] is not legitimately posited as the object of theology," his opinion is thus explained by Frassen (Scotus academicus, tom. I, disp. prooem., a. 2, q. 5.) and by Lychetus (ad loc. cit.), that it agrees in substance with St. Thomas, who (Summa, I., q. 1, a. 7.) assigns one subject, namely God under the reckoning of Deity. However the difference between both consists in this, that Scotus thinks, that this subject *God* is understood *materially*, as a thing and the cause of truths, which He contains virtually in Himself; but St. Thomas understands God in *formal* reckoning, that is as knowable and/or revealable, but not in Himself and subjectively. On this difference cf. Cajetan in his Commentarium and Macedo (Collationes doctrinae S.Thomae et Scoti, Coll. 2, diff. 4, sect 4.).

Sententia nunc communior accuratius distinguit in qualibet scientia tria obiecta: obiectum *materiale* (quod in theologia est

The now more common and more accurate opinion distinguishes in any science three objects: the *material* object (which in

omne a Deo revelatum) et duplex obiectum *formale*. Horum alterum se tenet ex parte subiecti, de quo est scientia, et est res ipsa, quae primo cognoscitur; hoc vocatur obiectum formale *quod*; alterum se tenet ex parte potentiae ut ratio, sub qua intelligimus, et vocatur obiectum formale *quo*. Hac ultima ratione illae scientiae, quae idem obiectum materiale habent, proprie distinguntur et specificantur.

theology is everything revealed by God) and the twofold *formal* object. The first of these is held on the part of the subject, concerning which the science is, and it is the thing itself, which one first becomes acquainted with; this is called the obiectum formale quod; the other is held on the part of potency as the reckoning, under which we understand it, and it is called the obiectum formale quo. By this last reckoning, those sciences, which have the same material object, are properly distinguished and specified.

Uti ex textu patet, S. Bonaventura aliter et tripliciter distinguit subiectum theologiae et secundum hanc distinctionem convenienter triplex subiectum theologiae assignat; sic diversas theologorum sententias nititur conciliare. Et notandum, quod *totum integrale* est compositum ex partibus, quae cum aliis constituunt totum, unde vocantur partes integrales. *Totum universale* vero est quodlibet superius substantiale sumtum ad suum inferius in linea praedicamentalis, ut animal ad hominem et homo ad Socratem. Ita Petrus Hispanus, Bonaventurae coaevus, in sua Summula super librum Topicorum, de locis concomitantibus. Nec sententia Seraphici contradicit S. Thomae, quo unum tantum assignat subiectum, cum hic subiectum praecise sumat ut subiectum *formale quod*. Non tamen negat S. Thomas, quod sub diversis respectibus etiam alia subiecta theologiae rationabiliter assingari possint; immo hoc in utroque loco infra citato sufficienter innuit. Ipse autem S. Bonanventura dicit in corpore questionis, et *Deum* esse subiectum, et *Christum*, et *res* et *signa* et *credibile*, tamen diversimode. Unde sibi constans in 1. conclusione ipse cum S. Thomas dicit, Deum esse subiectum theologiae; sed hoc aliter explicat, scil. ut subiectum *radicale*, ad quod omnia reducuntur ut ad principium. Hoc Trigosus intelligit de subiecto *formali adequato* et sic Seraphicum omnino ad sententiam S. Thomae trahit. Ex contextu tamen patet, intelligendum esse potius de subiecto *materiali*, quatenus Deus est *principium*, a quo omnia derivantur sive, ut dicit in Breviloquio p. I. c. 1: Subiectum, ut a quo omnia, est Deus. In 2. conclus. sub alio

As from the text it is clear, St. Bonaventure distinguishes in another and threefold manner the subject of theology and according to this distinction he conveniently assigns a threefold subject of theology; thus he strives to reconcile the diverse opinions of theologians. And it must be noted, that *the entire whole* has been composed from parts, which together with other things constitute the whole, whence the are called integral parts. But *universal whole* is any superior substantial taken according to its own inferior in the line of a predicament, as animal is to man and man to Socrates. Thus Peter the Spaniard, a contemporary of St. Bonaventure, in his Summula super librum Topicorum, on concomitant places. Nor does the opinion of the Seraphic Doctor contradict that of St. Thomas, by which only one thing is assigned as the subject, since here subject is taken precisely as the subiectum formale quod. However St. Thomas does not deny, that under diverse respects even other things can be reasonably assigned as subjects of theology; nay rather this in both places cited below he sufficiently hints at. Moreover St. Bonaventure himself say in the body of the question, both that *God* and *Christ*, and *thing* and *sign*, and *the credible* are the subject, however in diverse manners. Whence he himself establishing in conclusion 1. says together with St. Thomas, that God is the subject of theology; but he explains this in another manner, namely that He is the *radical* subject, to which all things are reduced as to their principle. This Trigosus understands of the *adequate formal* subject and thus draws the

respectu ponit Christum ut subiectum materiale adaequatum, per quod et de quo propinque omnia sciantur. In 3. conclus. ponit duplex subiectum, nempe *res* et *signa* sed sub ratione *credibilis*, et ipsum *credibile*, quatenus veritates revelatae per rationes fiunt intelligibiles et probabiles. In hac ultima conclusione vocabula *totum universale* significant subiectum *formale et attributionis*. Trigosus, Sum. S. Bonav. q. 1. a. 2. dub. 2; Hauzeur, Collatio totius theologiae, tom. I. q. 1.

Seraphic Doctor entirely towards the opinion of St. Thomas. From the context it is clear however, that it must be understood rather of the *material* subject, to the extent that God is *the principle*, from which all things are derived or, as he says in the Breviloquium, p. I, c. 1: The subject, from which all things are, is God. In conclusion 2. under another respect he posits Christ as the adequate material subject, through which and concerning which nearly all things are known. In conclusion 3. he posits a twofold subject, in fact [nempe] *things* and *signs* but under a reckoning *of the credible*, and God Himself as *credible*, to the extent that revealed truths becomes intelligible and probable through reasons. In this last conclusion the phrase *universal whole* signifies the subiectum *formale et attributionis*. Trigosus, Sum. S. Bonav. q. 1, a. 2, dub. 2; Hauzeur, Collatio totius theologiae, tom. I, q. 1..

VI. Auctores antiqui de hac quaestione tractantes: Breviloq. p. I . c. 1. — Alexander Hal., S. p. I. q. 1. m. 3. — Scotus, I. Sent. Prolog. q. 3; I. Report. Prolog. q. 1. — S. Thomas, I. Sent. Prolog. q. 1. a. 4; Sum. I. q. 1. a. 7. — B. Albertus M., Sum. p. 1. tr. 1. q. 3. m. 1; I. Sent. d. 1. a. 2. — Petrus a Tarantasia, I. Sent. Prolog. a. 3. — Richardus a Mediavilla, I. Sent. Prolog. q. 6. — Aegidius Romanus, I. Sent. Prolog. p. 1, princip. q. 1. — Henricus Gandaviensis, Sum. a. 19. a. 1. — Durandus, I. Sent. Prolog. q. 5. — Gabriel Biel, I. Sent. Prolog. q. 9.

VI. The ancient authors treating of this question: Breviloquium. p. I . c. 1. — Alexander Hales, Sum.. p. I. q. 1. m. 3. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, Sent., Bk. 1, Prolog., q. 3; Report., Bk. 1, Prolog, q. 1. — St. Thomas, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., q. 1, a. 4; Summa., I., q. 1, a. 7. — Bl. (now St.) Albert the Great, Summa., p. 1, tr. 1, q. 3, m. 1; Sent., Bk. I, d. 1, a. 2. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., a. 3. — Richard of Middletown, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., q. 6. — Giles the Roman, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., p. 1, princip. q. 1. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 19. q. 1. — Durandus, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., q. 5. — Gabriel Biel, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., q. 9.

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PROEMIUM IN LIBRUM PRIMUM SENTENTIARUM

QUAESTIONES PROEMII

Quaestio II.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 9-12.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

QUAESTIO II.

Quae causa formalis quive modus procendi sit in his libris Sententiarum.

Secundo quaeritur[1] de causa *formali* sive modo agendi. Et dictum est, quod est *perscrutatorius* et inquisitivus secretorum.

SED CONTRA: 1. Isaia quadragesimo:[2] *Deus dat secretorum scrutatores quasi non sint.*

2. Item, Proverbiorum vigesimo quinto:[3] *Perscrutator maiestatis opprimetur a gloria.*

3. Item, Ecclesiatici tertio:[4] *Altiora te ne quaesieris, et fortiora te ne scrutatus fueris.* Ergo, si ea quae Magister perscrutatur, sunt secreta, /

---

[1] Praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1, omissis verbis *Secundo quaeritur*, Vat. deinde addit *huius libri*. — *Et dictum est*, scilicet in Prooemio; *perscrutatorius*, id est rationativus sive rationalis, quod vocabulum S. Bonav. sumsit ex loco Iob, in principio Prooemii posito. Constat, quod, suppositis fidei principiis, per usum rationis formatur scientia theologica, cuius obiectum, ut supra q. 1. S. Doctor exposuit, est credibile, prout transit in rationem intelligibilis, et hoc per

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

FOREWORD TO THE FIRST BOOK OF THE SENTENCES

QUESTIONS ON THE FOREWORD

Question 2

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 9-12.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUESTION 2

What is the formal cause or manner of proceeding in these Books of Sentences?

Secondly there is asked[1] concerning the *formal* cause or manner of acting. And it has been said, that it is *thoroughly scrutatory* and inquisitive of secrets.

ON THE CONTRARY: 1. In the fortieth [chapter] of Isaiah:[2] *God causes the scrutinizers of secrets (to be) as if they were not.*

2. Likewise, in the twenty-fifth [chapter] of Proverbs:[3] *The thorough scrutinizer of (His) majesty will be oppressed by (His) glory.*

3. Likewise, in the third [chapter] of Ecclesiaticus:[4] *Lest you think of things higher than you, and scrutinize things stronger than you.* Therefore, if those things which Master (Peter) thoroughly scrutinizes, are secrets, /

---

[1] Contrary to the testimony of the manuscripts and edition 1, having omitted *Secondly there is asked*, the Vatican text then adds, *of this Book*. — *And it has been said*, that is in the Foreword; *thoroughly scrutatory*, that is reasoning [rationativus] or rational, which word St. Bonaventure takes from the passage in Job, quoted at the beginning of the Foreword. It is established, that, with the principles of the faith supposed, through the use of reason theological

additionem rationis.
[2] Vers. 23.
[3] Vers. 27; Vulgata legit: *Qui scrutator est maiestatis* etc.
[4] Vers. 22.

science is formed, whose object, as above in q. 1, the Seraphic Doctor has expounded, is the credible, in so far as it passes over into the reckoning of the intelligible, and this through the addition of reason.
[2] Verse 23.
[3] Verse 27; the Vulgate reads: *He who is a scrutinizer of (His) majesty . . .*.
[4] Verse 22.

---

sunt magna, sunt alta et fortia, male Magister procedit.

4. Item, *ratione* ostenditur sic: modus procendi in parte scientiae debet esse uniformis *modo* totalis scientiae;[1] sed modus procedendi in sacra Scriptura est typicus et per modum narrationis, non inquisitionis: cum ergo liber iste pertineat ad sacram Scripturam, non debet procedere inquirendo.

5. Item, modus agendi debet esse conveniens *materiae*, de qua est; unde in principio veteris Ethicae[2] dicitur: «Sermones inquirendi sunt secundum materiam » sed materia huius doctrinae est credibile; sed credibile est supra rationem: ergo modus procedendi per rationes non convenit huic doctrinae.

6. Item, modus agendi debet esse conveniens *fini*, ad quem ordinatur scientia; sed haec scientia, ut dicit Magister in littera,[3] ordinatur ad fidei promotionem; sed rationes fidem non promovent, sed evacuant; unde Gregorius:[4] « Fides non habet meritum, cui humana ratio praebet experimentum » ergo talis modus contrariatur fini, ergo non est conveniens. Unde et Ambrosius:[5] « Tolle, inquit, argumenta, cum de fide agitur. Piscatoribus creditur, non dialecticis ». Vanus ergo et inutilis videtur hic modus.

are great, are high and strong, (then) Master (Peter) proceeds badly.

4. Likewise, it is shown thus *by reason*: the manner of proceeding in a part of a science ought to be uniform with the *manner* of the whole science:[1] but the manner of proceeding in Sacred Scripture is typical [typicus] and through a manner of narration, not of inquisition: therefore since that Book of his pertains to Sacred Scripture, it ought not proceed by inquiring.

5. Likewise, the manner of acting ought to be convenient to the *matter*, which it concerns; whence in the beginning of the old Ethics[2] there is said: « The subject of a conversation [sermones] must be inquired into according to (its) matter » but the matter of this doctrine is the credible; but the credible is above reason: therefore the manner of proceeding through reasons is not convenient for this doctrine.

6. Likewise, the manner of acting ought to be convenient to the *end*, towards which the science is ordered; but this science, as Master (Peter) says in the text[3] is ordained to the promotion of the faith; but reasons do not promote the faith, but empty it; whence (St.) Gregory:[4] « The faith, for which human reason offers experiment, has not merit » therefore such a manner is contrary to the end, therefore it is not convenient. Whence even (St.) Ambrose:[5] « Take away, he said, the arguments, when on is dealing with faith. It was believed by fishermen, not dialecticians ». Therefore vain and useless does this manner seem.

SED CONTRA: 1. Primae Petri tertio:[6] *Parati, omni poscenti reddere rationem de ea quae in vobis est fide et spe.* Cum ergo multi sint, qui fidem nostram impugnant, non tantum rationem de ea poscunt; utile et congruum videtur per rationes eam astruere et modo inquisitivo et ratiocinando procedere: ergo etc.

ON THE CONTRARY: 1. In the third [chapter] of First Peter:[6] *(Be) prepared, to render to everyone requesting a reason concerning that faith and hope which is in you.* Therefore since there are many, who impugn our faith, they not only request a reason concerning it; it seems useful and congruous to build towards it through reasons and to proceed by an inquisitive manner and by reasoning [ratiocinando]: ergo etc..

2. Item, Richardus de sancto Victore in libro de Trinitate:[7] « Credo sine dubio, ad quorumlibet explanationem, quae necesse est esse, non modo probabilia, sed etiam necessaria argumenta non deese, licet contingat nostram industriam latere ». Ergo cum fides nostra credat necessaria, et illa habeant rationes latentes, et talia indigeant perscrutatione, ut enodentur;[8] patet quod modus perscrutatorius maxime convenit huic scientiae.

2. Likewise, Richard of St. Victor in (his) book On the Trinity:[7] « I believe without doubt, that for the explanation of anything, what is necessary is that there be not only probable, but also that there be not lacking necessary arguments, though it may happen that our effort [industriam] be hidden. Therefore since our faith believes necessaries, those also have hidden reasons, and such need a thorough scrutinization, to be unknotted;[8] it is clear that a thoroughly scrutatory manner is most convenient to this science.

3. Item, non est peioris conditionis veritas fidei nostrae quam aliae veritates; sed in aliis veritatibus ita est, quod omnis, quae potest per rationem impugnari, potest et debet per rationem defendi: ergo pari ratione et veritas fidei nostrae.

3. Likewise, the truth of our faith is not of a worse condition than other truths; but in the other truths it is thus, that everyone, which can be impugned through reason, can be and ought to be defended through reason: therefore by an equal reason also the truth of our faith.

4. Item, non est modo fides nostra peioris conditionis quam in principio; sed in principio, quando impugnabatur per falsa miracula magorum, defendebatur per vera Sanctorum: ergo cum modo impugnetur per falsa argumenta haereticorum, debet defendi per vera argumenta doctorum.

4. Likewise, our faith is now not of a worse condition than in the beginning; but in the beginning, when it used to be impugned through the false miracles of the magicians, it used to be defended through the true ones of the Saints: therefore when it is now impugned through the false arguments of heretics, it ought to be defended through the true arguments of teachers.

CONCLUSIO.

Modus procedendi perscrutatorius sive ratiocinativus convenit huic doctrinae, cum valeat ad confundendum adversarios fidei, ad fovendum infirmos in fide, ad delectandum perfectos.

CONCLUSION

The thoroughly scrutatory or reasoned [ratiocinativus] *manner of proceeding is convenient to this doctrine, since it prevails to confound the adversaries of the faith, to warm the infirm in faith, (and) to delight the perfect.*

RESPONDEO: Dicendum, quod modus perscrutatorius convenit huic doctrinae sive libro. Cum enim finis imponat necessitatem his quae sunt ad findem; quia, sicut dicit Philosophus:[9] « Serra est dentata, quia est ad secandum » sic iste liber, quia est ad promotionem fidei, habet modum inquisitivum. Modus enim ratiocinativus sive inquisitivus valed at fidei promotionem, et hoc tripliciter secun / dum tria genera hominum.

I RESPOND: It must be said, that the thoroughly scrutatory manner is convenient for this doctrine or book. For since the end imposes a necessity for those thing which are for the end; because, as the Philosopher says:[9] « A saw is toothed, because it is for cutting » so this book of his, because it is for the promotion of the faith, it has an inquisitive manner (of proceeding). For the ratiocinative or inquisitive manner prevails for the promotion of the faith, and this in a threefold manner according / to the three genera of men.

---

[1] Cod. R propositionem maiorem sic exhibet: *modus procedendi in scientia debet convenire scientiae*.
[2] Nullius mss. auctoritate ponit Vat. *primo Ethicorum*. Lectio mss. confirmatur codice lat. 6569 Bibliothecae Regalis Parisiensis, qui continet Aristotelis Ethicam in duas partes distributam. Prima pars comprehendit *primum* Ethicorum librum estque translationis graeco-latinae, uti ex verbo *proheresis*, quod iam in principio occurrit, colligitur. Haec pars intitulatur *Ethica nova*. Secunda pars complecitur *secundum et tertium* Ethocorum librum et vocatur *Ethica vetus*. Vide Jourdain: Recherches critiques sur l'âge et l'orgine des traductions latines d'Aristote, pag. 179, ubi et de hac *Ethica veteri* adiungitur: Non videtur mihi, quod haec translatio sit aetatis multum antiquioris. Ibidem citatur alia graeco-latina translatio Ethicorum, quae in operibus S. Thomae sub nomine *Translatio vetus* invenitur, in eaque (II. c. 2.) locus a S. Bonaventura allegatus sic exhibetur: Sermones sunt expetendi secundum materiam. Similis locus habetur quidem I. Ethic. c. 3, qui tamen etiam in cit. antiqua translatione aliis verbis exhibetur: Dicetur autem utique sufficienter, si secundum subiectam materiam manifestetur. — Mox Vat., refragantibus mss. et ed. 1 pro *sed credibile* non ita bene *et credibile*, quia est minor subsumta. In hac propositione forsan respicitur illud Dionysii de Div. Nom. c. 1: Eius quidem (Divinitatis) scientia et contemplatio omnibus invia est.
[3] Infra in Prologo.
[4] Homil. 26. in Evang.
[5] Quoad hunc textum Ambrosii notamus, quod ipse tam in mss. quam in Vat. exhibetur sub nomine Hieronymi, at falso; non enim in operibus S. Hieronymi habetur, sed in Ambrosii libro I, de Fide c. 13. n. 84. his verbis proferetur: Aufer argumenta, ubi fides quaeritur. . . non creditur philosophis, creditur piscatoribus; non creditur dialecticis, creditur publicanis. — In quo textu Vat., non consentientibus antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1, ante *piscatoribus* ponit *pastoribus et*.
[6] Vers. 15, ubi Vulgata legit: Parati semper ad

[1] Codex R. exhibits the major in this manner: *the manner of proceeding in science ought to be convenient to the science.*
[2] On the basis of the authority of none of the manuscripts, the Vatican text reads *of the first Ethics*. The reading of the manuscripts is confirmed by codex lat. 6569 in the Royal Library of Paris, which contains Aristotle's Ethics arranged in two parts. The first part comprehends the *first* book of the Ethics and belongs to the Greco-Latin translation, as is gathered from the word proheresis, which found even at the beginning. This part is entitled New Ethics. The second part comprises the *second and third* book of the Ethics and is called the Old Ethics. See Jourdain's Recherches critiques sur l'âge et l'origine des traductions latines d'Aristote, p. 179, where concerning this Old Ethics there is added: It does not seem to me, that this translation is much older in age. In the same work there is cited another Greco-Latin translation of the Ethics, which is found in the works of St. Thomas under the name *Old Translation*, and in that (II. c. 2) the passage alleged by St. Bonaventure is exhibited thus: The subjects of conversations [sermones] are to be sought out according to (their) matter. Indeed a similar passage is found in the Ethics, Bk. I, ch. 3, which is however even in the ancient translation exhibited in other words: But it is said in a sufficient manner at any rate, if it is manifested according to the subject matter. — Then the Vatican text, breaking with the manuscripts and edition 1, has in place of *but the credible*, the not so well *and the credible*, because it is the minor supposition. In this proposition there is perhaps referred to that passage from Dionysius (the Areopagite), On the Divine Names, ch. 1: Indeed the science and contemplation of His (Divinity) is impassible to all things.
[3] Cf. the Prologue.
[4] Homil. 26. in Evang.
[5] In regard to this text of (St.) Ambrose we note, that it is exhibited both in the manuscripts and in the Vatican text under the name of (St.) *Jerome*, but falsely; for it is not found in the works of St.

satisfactionem omni poscenti vos rationem de ea quae in vobis est spe. — Mox lectionem Vat. *utique* pro *non tantum*, in quae et constructio propositionis perturbatur et sensus ipsius non integre redditur, emendamus ex fere omnibus mss. (aliqui ut H ff falso habent *non tantum*) et ed. 1. Cod. B vero bene explicans aliorum codd. lectionem ponit *et non tantum*. Mox cod. R non ita bene *eos instruere* loco *eam astruere*; et immediate post ex codd. A F G H I R S T etc. cum ed. 1 *inquisitivo* pro *inquisitorio* substituimus.

[7] Libr. I. c. 4. — Vat., reluctantibus mss. et ed. 1, circa initium huius textus mittit relativum *quae* et verbum *est*, quibus omissis sensus omnino perturbatur.

[8] Plures codd. ut M P Z cum ed. 1 *enucleentur*.

[9] Aristot., II. Phyus. in fine, text. 92, ubi legitur: Haec autem (divisio sive sectio) non erit, nisi serra habeat dentes tales. Et I. de Partib. animal. c. 5: Non enim sectio serrae gratia facta est, sed serra sectionis gratia.

Jerome, but in (St.) Ambrose's book, On the Faith, Bk. 1, ch. 13, n. 84 these words are cited: Bear off arguments, where faith is sought . . . it is not believed by philosophers, it is believed by fishermen; it is not believed by dialecticians, it is believed by publicans. — In which text, the Vatican text, not agreeing with the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, places *shepherds and* before *fishermen*.

[6] Verse 15, where the Vulgate reads: Always prepared for the satisfaction of everyone requesting (from) you a reason concerning that hope which is in you. — Then the reading of the Vatican text, having *at any rate* in place of *not only*, in which both the construction of the proposition is perturbed and its sense is not rendered integrally, we have emended from nearly all the manuscripts (some as H and FF have falsely *not only*) and from edition 1. But codex B, well explaining the reading of the other codices, has *and not only*. Then codex R has not so well *instructing them* in place of *building towards it*; and immediately afterwards from codices A F G H I R S T etc. together with edition 1 we have substituted *inquisitive* in place of *inquisitory*.

[7] Book I, ch. 4. — The Vatican text, with the manuscripts and edition 1 disagreeing, introduces the relative *which* and the word *is* around the beginning of this quote, which having been omitted entirely altered the sense (of the text).

[8] Very many codices, as M P and Z together with edition 1 have *be thoroughly explained* [enucleentur].

[9] Aristotle, Physics, Bk. II in fine, text 92, where there is read: But this (dividing or cutting) will not be, unless the saw have such teeth. And On the Parts of Animals, Bk. I, ch. 5: For the cutting has been made for the sake of the saw, but the saw for sake of cutting.

---

p. 11

secun / dum tria genera hominum. Quidam enim sunt fidei *adversarii*, quidam sunt in fide *infirmi*, quidam vero *perfecti*.

Modus inquisitivus valet *primo ad confundendum adversarios*. Unde Augustinus primo de Trinitate:[1] Adversus garrulos ratiocinatores elatiores quam capaciores rationibus catholicis et similitudinibus congruis ad defensionem et assertionem fidei est utendum. *Secundo* valet *ad fovendum infirmos*. Sicut enim Deus caritatem infirmorum fovet per beneficia temporalia, sic fidem infirmorum fovet[2] per argumenta probabilia. Si enim infirmi viderent, rationes ad fidei probabilitatem deficere

to the three genera of men. For certain ones are *adversaries* of the faith, certain ones are *infirm* in the faith, but certain ones (have been) *perfected*.

The inquisitive manner prevails *first to confound adversaries*. Whence (St.) Augustine in the first [book] On the Trinity:[1] Against the garrulous ratiocinators, more elated than capable, one must use catholic reasons and congruous similitudes for the defense and assertion of the faith. *Secondly* it prevails *to warm the infirm*. For as God warms the charity of the infirm through temporal benefactions [beneficia], so does it warm[2] the faith of the infirm through probable arguments. For if the infirm saw, reasons

et ad oppositum abundare, nullus persisteret. *Tertio* valet *ad delectandum perfectos*. Miro enim modo anima delectatur in intelligendo quod perfecta fide credit. Unde Bernardus:[3] « Nihil libentius intelligimus, quam quod iam fide credimus ».

for the faith lacking probability and (those) for the opposite abounding, no one would persist (in faith). *Thirdly* it prevails *to delight the perfect*. For in a wonderful manner the soul delights in understanding what it believes with a perfect faith. Whence (St.) Bernard:[3] « We understand nothing more freely, than what we already believe by faith. ».

1. 2. 3. Quod ergo obiicitur in contrarium, dicendum quod omnes illae auctoritates intelliguntur de perscrutatione curiosa, non de perscruatione studiosa. Nam ipse Dominus dixit Iudaeis, Ioannis quinto:[4] *Scrutamini scripturas* etc..

1. 2. 3. Therefore because it is objected in the contrary, it must be said, that all those authorities are understood concerning a curious, thorough scrutinization, not concerning a studious, thorough scrutinization. For the Lord Himself said to the Jews, in the fifth [chapter of the Gospel] of St. John:[4] *Scrutinize the Scriptures* etc..

4. Quod obiicitur, quod iste[5] modus non competit sacrae Scripturae; dicendum ad hoc, quod liber iste ad sacram Scripturam reducitur per modum cuiusdam subalternationis, non partis principalis; similiter et libri doctorum, qui sunt ad fidei defensionem. Quod patet sic: quia non *quaelibet* determinatio trahens in partem facit subalternationem scientiae, sed determinatio quodam modo *distrahens*.[6] Nam scientia de linea recta non dicitur subalternari geometriae, sed scientia de linea visuali, quoniam haec determinatio quodam modo trahit ad alia principia. Quoniam igitur sacra Scriptura est de credibili ut credibili,[7] hic est de credibili ut facto intelligibili, et haec determinatio *distrahit* — « nam quod credimus debemus auctoritati, et quod intelligimus, rationi »[8] — hinc est, quod sicut alius modus certitudinis est in scientia superiori et inferiori, ita alius modus certitudinis est in sacra Scriptura et alius in hoc libro, et ideo alius modus procedendi. Et sicut scientia subalternata, ubi deficit, redit ad certidudinem scientiae subalternantis, quae maior est; sic etiam, cum Magistro deficit certitudo rationis, recurrit ad auctoritatis certitudinem[9] sacrae Scripturae, quae excedit omnem certitudinem rationis.

4. Because it is objected, that his[5] manner is not suited [competit] to Sacred Scripture; it must be said that in this regard, that his book is reduced to Sacred Scripture through the manner of a certain subalternation, not of the principle part; similarly also the books of teachers, which are for the defense of the faith. Which is thus clear: because not *every* determination drawing into a part causes a subalternation of a science, but (only) a determination *drawing apart* in a certain manner.[6] For the science of the straight line is not said to be subalternated to geometry, but the science of the visual line (is), since this determination in a certain manner draws towards other principles. Therefore since Sacred Scripture concerns the credible as credible,[7] this concerns the credible as made intelligible, and this determination *draws apart* — « for what we believe, we ought to from authority, and what we understand, from reason »[8] — hence it is, that as there is a different [alius] manner of certitude in superior and inferior science, so there is one [alius] manner of the certitude in Sacred Scripture and another in this book, and for that reason (there is) another manner of proceeding. And as a subalternated science, where it is lacking, returns to the certitude of the subalternating science, which is greater;

so also, when there is lacking to Master (Peter) the certitude of reason, he has recourse to the certitude[9] of Sacred Scripture, which exceeds every certitude of reason.

5. Quod tu obiicis, quod[10] debet convenire *materiae*; dicendum, quod convenit. Et quod obicitur, quod credibile est supra rationem; verum est, supra rationem quantum ad *scientiam acquisitam*,[11] sed non supra rationem *elevatam per fidem* et per donum scientiae et intellectus. Fides enim elevat ad assentiendum; scientia et intellectus elevant ad ea quae credita sunt intelligendum.

5. Because you object, that[10] it ought to be convenient to the *matter*; it must be said, that it is convenient. And because it is objected, that the credible is above reason; (it must be said that) it is true, that (it is) above reason as much as regards *acquired science*,[11] but (it is) not above reason *elevated through faith* and through the gift of knowledge [scientiae] and understanding. For faith elevates one to assent (to what is to be believed); (the gifts of) knowledge and understanding elevate one to understand what has been believed.

6. Quod obiicitur, quod[12] non convenit *fini*, quia evacuat meritum; dicendum, quod, quando assentitur propter se rationi, tunc aufertur locus fidei, quia in anima hominis dominatur violentia rationis. Sed quando fides non assentit propter rationem, sed propter amorem eius cui assentit, desiderat habere rationes; tunc non evacuat ratio humana meritum, sed auget solatium. Et primo modo intelligit[13] Hieronymus, quod non sunt inducenda argumenta dialectica, quibus homo principaliter innitatur, quia innitendum est auctoritati principalius quam rationi.

Because it is objected, that it[12] is not convenient to the *end*, because it empties merit; it must be said, that, when it is assented to on account of reason itself, then it bears off a place for faith, because in the soul of a man the violence of reason dominates. But when faith does not assent on account of reason, but on account of love of Him to whom it assents, it desires to have reasons; it then does not empty human reason of merits, but augments solace. And in the first manner[13] (St.) Jerome understands, that dialectical arguments must not be introduced, by which a man would be principally supported, because one must be more principally supported by authority than by reason.

---

[1] Cap. 2, ubi dicitur: Istis garrulis ratiocinatoribus, elatioribus quam capacioribus atque ideo morbo periculosiore laborantibus, sic fortasse serviemus, ut inveniant aliquid, unde dubitare non possint. — Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1 in hoc textu post *ratiocinatoribus* addit *magis*.
[2] Cod. K hic addit *quis*, sed non bene, ut videtur.
[3] Libr. V. de Consid. c. 3. in fine: Nil autem malumus scire, quam quae fide iam scimus.
[4] Vers. 39.
[5] Substituimus ex anitquioribus mss. et ed. 1 *iste* pro *ille*.
[6] Id est, quae rem ad alium conceptum vel ad alia principia specialia trahit.
[7] Ita antiquiores mss. (quorum aliqui ut A F G P Q

[1] Chapter 2, where there is said; Those garrulous ratiocinators, more elated than capable and for that reason suffering with a more dangerous disease, let us serve so that they may perhaps find something, whence they cannot not doubt. — In this quote, the Vatican text against the manuscripts and edition 1 adds *rather* before *more elated*.
[2] Here codex K adds *who*, but not well, as is seen.
[3] On Considerations, Bk. V, ch. 3 in fine: But we prefer to know nothing, which we know already by faith.
[4] Verse 39.
[5] We have substituted from the more ancient manuscripts and from edition 1 *his* [iste] in place

ee cum ed. 1 ante *credibili* repetunt praepositionem *de*) contra Vat., quae habet *credibile*. — Mox per demonstrativum *hic* intelligitur liber Sententiarum. Cod. B addit *vero*, cod. O habet *haec autem scientia* loco *hic*. Dein cod. F pro *facto* ponit *ratione*.
8 August. de Utilit. credendi c. 11. n. 25: Quod intelligimus igitur debemus rationi, quod credimus auctoritati. In quo textu plures codd. ut F G H T etc. cum Vat. *debetur* pro *debemus*.
9 Vat. cum recentiori cod. dd, omittendo *certitudinem*, legit *auctoritates*; codd. B L N O T ee lectionem Vat. servantes addunt *et ad certitudinem*; codd. autem C D F M P Q U W X Z aa bb exhibent lectionem in textum receptam, quam praeferimus eo, quod in ipsa duae species certitudinis, scilicet *auctoritatis* et *rationis*, distinctiori modo exhibentur.
10 Supple: *modus*, quod Vat. sola addit. — Cod. R *obiicitur* loco *tu obiicis*.
11 Hoc est, habitam investigatione naturalis rationis et modo naturali, qui secundum Scholasticos a via sensus et experientiae incipit. Huic scientiae opponitur scientia infusa, sub qua continetur cognitio fidei, utpote quae tam respectu obiecti cogniti, quam respectu modi cognoscendi homini immediate a Deo praestatur. Cfr. III. Sent. d. 35. a. 2. — Vat. absque auctoritate mss. et ed. 1 hic addit *per rationem evidentem*, quam additionem tamen nimis arctam iudicamus; certum siquidem est quod ratio, nisi elevetur per donum fidei, ad stricte credibilium cognitionem ne quidem *probabilem* pertingere non possit. Melius cod. K pro *ad scientiam acquisitam* ponit *ratio in se consideratur*. Mox plurimi codd. A B C D F G I L M P Q S T V X Y ee *sapientiae* loco *scientiae*, quod tamen ex subnexis improbatur.
12 Supple: modus iste. — Mox ad idem subiectum propositionis servandum fide multorum mss. A F G I K R S T etc. et ed. 1 praeferimus *evacuat* passivo *evacuatur*, quod habet Vat.
13 Faventibus mss. et ed. 1, removimus additionem VAt. *Gregorius similiter et*, quae additio, sicuti iacet, omissa scil. qualibet interpunctione, erronea est, quia quae sequuntur non respiciunt verba Gregorii, sed solummodo Hieronymi. Cod. D post *intelligit* adiungit particulam *et*.

of *that*.
6 That is, which draws a thing towards another concept and/or to other special principles.
7 Thus the more ancient manuscripts (some of which, as A F G P Q and ee together with edition 1 repeat *concerning* [de] before *credible*) against the Vatican text, which has *credible* [credibile]. Next by the demonstrative *this* there is understood the Book of Sentences. Codex B adds *but* before this [trans.: according to the English syntax], and codex O has *but this science* in place of *this*. Then codex F puts *an intelligible reason* in place of *made intelligible*.
8 (St.) Augustine, On the Utility of Believing, ch. 11, n. 25: That which we therefore understand, we ought to by reason, what we believe, by authority. In which text very many of the codices as F G H T etc. together with the Vatican text have *ought to be* in place of *we ought to*.
9 The Vatican text together with the more recent codex cc, by omitting *the certitude of*, reads *authorities* ; codices B L N O T and ee following the Vatican reading add *and to certitude*; but codices C D F M P Q U W X Z aa and bb exhibit the reading received in the text, which we prefer for the reason that in it the two species of certitude, namely *of authority* and *of reason*, are exhibited in a more distinct manner.
10 Supply *the manner*, which only the Vatican texts adds. — Codex R has *it is objected* in place of *you object*.
11 That is, a habit (acquired) by the investigation of natural reason and in a natural manner, which according to the Scholastics begins from the way of sense and experience. To this science is opposed scientia infusa, under which is contained the cognition of faith, which to this extent [utpote] is offered immediately by God to man, as much in respect to the object cognized, as in respect to the manner of cognizing. Cf. Sent., Bk. III, d. 35, a. 2. — Here the Vatican text without the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1 adds *through evident reason*, which addition, however, we judge to be exceedingly strict; (this is) certain even if it is that reason, unless it be elevated by the gift of faith, cannot stretch to the cognition of credibles, strictly speaking, nor indeed to the *probable* (cognition of them). This is better had in codex K which places *reason is considered in itself* in place of *regards acquired science*. Next very many of the codices A B C D F G I L M P Q S T V X Y and ee have *of wisdom* in place of *of knowledge*, which however is disproved from what follows.
12 Supply: his manner. — Next to keep the same subject in the proposition, we have, on the testimony of manuscripts A F G I K R S T etc. and edition 1, preferred *empties* to the passive *is emptied*, which the Vatican text has.
13 Favoring the manuscripts and edition 1, we have removed the addition made by the Vatican text, *similarly (St.) Gregory and*, which addition, as is stated, having omitted punctuation, is erroneous, because what follows does not refer to the words of (St.) Gregory, but only of (St.)

Jerome, Codex D adds the particle *also* [et] before *understands*.

p. 12

SCHOLION

I. In solut. *ad 4.* S. Doctor tangit aliam quaestionem, utrum scil. theologia sit *scientia subalternata*, de qua scholae Scoti et D. Thomae dissentiunt, quatenus eius subalternatio intelligitur respectu *theologiae beatorum*. Scotus enim negativam sententiam tenet, sumendo *subalternationem* in sensu stricto cum omnibus conditionibus, quas requirit Aristoteles (I. Poster. c. 10); S. Thom. vero (S. I. q. 1. a. 2) subalternationem aliquam admittit. Seraphicus autem hic loquitur tantum de subalternatione relate ad *s. Scripturam* et in hac solutione omnino concordat cum S. Thomas (S. I. q. 1. a. 2), Scoto (hic Prolog. q. 4. et 5.) aliisque doctoribus. — De subalternatione respectu theologiae *beatorum* cfr. Sctos., I. Report. Prolog. q. 3. a. 3. quaestiunc. 4; I. Sent. Prolog. q. 4. 5. — S. Thom., S. I. q. 4. a. 2. cum Comment. Caietani. — B. Albert., I. Sent. d. 1. a. 4 ad ult. — Richard. a Med., I. Sent. Prolog. q. 1. et 5. — Aegid. R., I. Sent. Prolog. p. 1. princ. 2. q. 1. — Henr. Gand., S. A 7. a. 4. et seqq. — Durand., I. Sent. Prolog. q. 7. et 8.

II. Cum dicitur in solut. *ad 6.*: Quando assentitur propter se rationi; sensus est: quando homo non habet voluntatem aliquid credendi nisi propter rationem convincentem. Cfr. Sent. d. 24. a. 2. q. 1. ad 2. et 5. — Notabilis est forma locutionis: « In anima hominis *dominatur violentia rationis* ». Ratio enim humana, quae se intra suos limites angustos claudendo influxum primae veritatis reiicit legitimoque suo Domino obsequium denegat, iusto iudicio condemnatur, ut sub iugo erroris servire debeat.

III. In solutione ipsius quaestionis omnes doctores satis consentiunt, et plurima hic

SCHOLIUM

I. In the solution *to n. 4* the Seraphic Doctor touches another question, namely whether theology is *a subalternated science*, concerning which the school of Scotus and the divine Thomas disagree, to the extent that its *subalternation* is understood in respect to the *theology of the blessed*. For (Bl. John Duns) Scotus holds a negative opinion, taking *subalternation* in the strict sense with all the conditions, which Aristotle requires (I. *Posterior Analytics*, ch. 10); but St. Thomas (Summa., I, q. 1, a. 2) admits some subalternation. Moreover, here the Seraphic (Doctor) speaks only of subalternation related to *Sacred Scripture* and in this solution he entirely agrees with St. Thomas (ibid.), with Bl. John Duns Scotus (here in the Prologue, q. 4. and 5) and with other doctors. — On subalternation in respect to the theology of the *blessed*, cf. (Bl. John Duns) Scotus., Reportatio, Bk. I, Prolog., q. 3, a. 3, quaestiunc. 4; Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., q. 4 and 5. — St. Thomas, Summa., I., q. 4, a. 2 together with Cajetan's commentary. — Bl. (now St.) Albert the Great, Sent., Bk. I, d. 1, a. 4 to the end. — Richard of Middletown, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., q. 1, and 5. — Giles the Roman, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., p. 1, princple n 2, q. 1. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a 7, q. 4 ff.. — Durandus, Sent., Bk. I., Prolog., q. 7, et 8.

II. When it is said in solution *to n. 6*: When it is assented to on account of reason itself; the sense is: when a man does not have the will to believe anything except on account of a convincing reason. Cf. Sent., (Bk. I,) d. 24, a. 2, q. 1, at nn. 2 and 5. — The form of expression is notable: « In the soul of man *the violence of reason dominates* ». For human reason which by closing itself within its own narrow limits rejects the influx of prime truth and denies its obsequium to its own legitimate Lord, is condemned by a just judgment, to duely serve under the yoke of error.

III. In the solution to the same question all the Doctors are in sufficient agreement,

dicta confirmantur Conc. Vaticano cap. IV. de fide cath. — Bonav. Breviloq. Prooem.; comment. in Evang. S. Ioannis, Prolog. n. 10. (in I. tom. Suppl. Bonelli). — Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 2. m. 3. a. 4. — Scot., I. Sent. Prolog. q. 3. in fine; II. Sent. d. 1. q. 4. — S. Thom., I. Sent. Prolog. q. 1. a. 5; S. I. q. 1. a 8. — B. Albert., S. p. I. tr. 1. q. 5; I. Sent. d. 1. a. 5. — Petr. a Tar., I. Sent. Prolog. a. 6. — Richard. a Med., I. Sent. Prolog. q. 7. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 14. q. 2; a. 8. q. 1. — Dionys. Carth., I. Sent. Prolog. q. 3. — Durand., I. Sent. Prolog. q. 1. — Gabr. Biel, I. Sent. Prolog. q. 7.

and very many of the things said here are confirmed by the Vatican Council, On the Catholic Faith, ch. IV. — St. Bonaventure, Breviloquium, Foreword; Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, Prologue, n. 10. (in the first volume of Supplementary Writings, by Bonell). — Alexander Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 2, m. 3, a. 4. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., q. 3. in fine; Bk. II, d. 1, q. 4. — St. Thomas, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., q. 1, a. 5; Summa. I., q. 1, a 8. — Bl. (now St.) Albert the Great, Summa., p. I., tr. 1, q. 5; Sent., Bk. I, d. 1, a. 5. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., a. 6. — Richard of Middletown, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., q. 7. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 14, q. 2 and a. 8, q. 1. — (Bl.) Denis the Carthusian, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., q. 3. — Durandus, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog. q. 1. — Gabriel Biel, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog. q. 7.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis

S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PROEMIUM IN LIBRUM PRIMUM SENTENTIARUM

QUAESTIONES PROEMII

Quaestio III.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 12-14.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio

Cardinal Bishop of Alba & Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

FOREWORD TO THE FIRST BOOK OF THE SENTENCES

QUESTIONS ON THE FOREWORD

Question 3

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 12-14.
Notes by the Quarrachi Editors.

QUAESTIO III.

QUESTION 3

Utrum hic liber sive theologia sit contemplationis gratia, an ut boni fiamus, sive utrum sit scientia speculativa, an practica.

Whether this book or theology is for the sake of contemplation, or that we become good, or whether it is a speculative or practical science?

Tertio quaeritur[1] de causa *finali*. Et cum dictum sit, quod liber iste est ad revelandum abscondita, quaeritur, utrum opus hoc sit contemplationis gratia, vel ut boni fiamus. Et quod sit, ut boni fiamus, videtur sic.

Thirdly there is asked[1] concerning the *final* cause. And since it has been said, that this book is for revealing things hidden away, it is asked, whether this work is for the sake of contemplation, and/or that we become good. And that it is, that we become good, it seems thus.

1. Omnis doctrina, quae est de his, sine quorum congitione non contingit recte vivere, est, ut boni fiamus; sed iste liber est ad cognitionem verae[2] fidei, sine qua *impossibile est placere Deo* nec recte vivere, ut dicitur ad Hebraeos undecimo:[3] ergo iste liber est, ut boni fiamus.

1. Every doctrine, which concerns these things, without the cognition of which one does not happened to live uprightly, is (for this), that we become good; but this book of his is for the cognition of the true[2] faith, without which *it is impossible to please God* and live uprightly, as is said in the eleventh (chapter) to the Hebrews:[3] therefore that book of his is (for this), that we become good.

2. Item, omnis doctrina, quae convenit cum *virtute* in obiecto, est, ut boni fiamus; haec per se manifesta est; sed haec doctrina convenit cum fide in obiecto, quia est de credibili, de quo etiam est fides sive in quo; ergo etc.

2. Likewise, every doctrine, which convenes with *virtue* in object, is (for this), that we become good; this is self-manifest [per se manifesta]; but this doctrine convenes with faith in object, because it concerns the credible, of which also, or in which, is faith; ergo etc..

3. Item, doctrina particularis conveit cum totali in *fine*; sed finis totalis Scripturae sacrae non est tantum, ut fiamus boni, sed etiam ut fiamus beati; et beatitudo est optimum: ergo finis istius scientiae est, ut boni fiamus.

3. Likewise, a particular doctrine convenes with the whole in (its) *end*; but the end of the whole of Scripture is not only, that we become good, but also that we become blessed; and beatitude is the best: therefore the end of that science of his is (this), that we become good.

CONTRA: 1. Magister dicit in littera,[4] quod finis sive intentio sua « est theologicarum inquisitionum abdita pandere », sed hoc pertinet ad eum, cuius finis est speculatio: ergo etc.

ON THE CONTRARY: 1. Master (Peter) says in (his) text,[4] that his end or intention « is to lay open those things withdrawn from theological inquiries » but this pertains to him, whose end is speculation: ergo etc..

2. Item, scientia quae est, ut boni fiamus, pertinet ad mores; sed cum theologia sit de fide[5] et moribus, liber autem iste de his quae spectant ad fidem, non de his quae spectant ad mores: ergo opus hoc non est, ut boni fiamus.

2. Likewise, the science which is, that we become good, pertains to morals; but although theology concerns faith[5] and morals, that book of his, however, (concerns) these things which look towards faith, not these which look towards morals: therefore this work is not, that we become good.

3. Item, omnis scientia, quae est, ut boni fiamus, est practica; sed omnis talis est de his quae sunt ab opere nostro;[6] sed haec

3. Likewise, every science, which is, that we become good, is practical; but every such (science) concerns these things which are

non est de his quae sunt ab opere nostro, sed a Deo: ergo est contemplationis gratia, non ut boni fiamus.

by our work;[6] but this does not concern these things which are by our work, but by God: therefore it is for the sake of contemplation, not that we become good.

[1] Vat. proprio marte omittit *Tertio quaeritur*.
[2] Ita plures codd. ut A I K T X etc. cum ed. 1 contra Vat., quae habet *nostrae*; praeferimus lectionem codd., utpote quae est S. Doctori familiarior et planius exprimit praerequisitum ad recte vivendum.
[3] Vers. 6.
[4] In Prolog. vide infra.
[5] Substituimus particulam *et* pro *non de*. Dubium quidem non leve hac in re ingerebatur nobis eo, quod, cum Scholasticorum tempore theologia communiter dicta contineretur compendiose in libro Sententiarum, sicuti de isto libro statim subiicitur, quod sit *de his quae spectant ad fidem, non de his quae spectant ad mores*, ita etiam de theologia dicendum sit, quod *sit de fide, non de moribus*. Sed consentientibus omnibus mss. ed ed. 1, lectionem Vat. mutavimus; qua mutatione supposita, *theologia* largiori sensu accipienda est, quatenus diversas complectitur disciplinas. — Mox plures codd. inter quod et cod. T cum ed. 1 post *iste* addunt *est*.
[6] Duabus his propositionibus consimiles habet Aristot., II. Ethic. c. 2: Quoniam praesens tractatio (Ethicae) non est speculationis causa, quemadmodum aliae; non enim fit, ut cognoscamus, quid sit virtus, sed ut boni efficiamur. Et II. Metaph. text. 3. (I. brevior. c. 1.): Speculativae etenim (scientiae) finis veritas, practicae autem opus. — Secundum huius argumenti propositionem cod. K ita exhibet: *et omnis scientia practica est de his quae sunt ab opere nostro, non a Deo: sed ista scientia non est* etc.

[1] The Vatican text omits *Thirdly it is asked* for its own reasons.
[2] Thus very many of the codices as A I K T X etc. together with edition 1 against the Vatican text, which has *our*; we prefer the reading of the codices, as it is more familiar to the style of the Seraphic Doctor and expresses more plainly the prerequisite for upright living.
[3] Verse 6.
[4] In the Prologue, v. infra.
[5] We have substituted the particle *and* in place of *not*. Indeed doubt has not lightly entered into our own mind in this regard, because, since the time of the Scholastics theology, commonly speaking, is contained in an compendious manner in the Book of Sentences, as if it were immediately the subject of this book, which concerns *these things which look to faith, not these which look to morals*, so that even of theology must be said, that *it concerns faith, not morals*. But with the consent of all the manuscripts and edition 1 we have changed the reading of the Vatican text; having supposed which change, *theology* must be accepted in the broader sense, to the extent that it comprises diverse disciplines. — Next very many of the codices, among whom are even codex T together with edition 1, adds *concerns* [est] after *that book of his*.
[6] Aristotle has things similar to these two propositions in *Ethics*, Bk. II, ch. 2: Since the present treatise (the Ethics) is not for the sake of speculation, to the measure that it (belongs) to another; for it has not come into being, that we may cognize, what is virtue, but that we may be made good. And in the Metaphysics, Bk. II, text 3 (the Shorter Metaphysics, Bk. 1, ch. 1): For speculative (science's) end is also truth, but practical's work. — Following to the proposition of this argument, codex K has: *and every practical science concerns these things which are from our work, not from God: but that science of his does not* etc..

p. 13

CONCLUSIO.

Scientia theologica est habitus affectivus et medius inter speculativum et practicum, et pro fine habet tum contemplationem, tum ut boni fiamus, et quidem principalius, ut boni fiamus.

CONCLUSION

Theological science is an affective habit and the mean between the speculative and practical, and for (its) end it has both contemplation, and that we become good, and indeed more principally, that we become good.

RESPONDEO: Ad intelligentiam praedictorum notandum est, quod perfectibile a scientia est intellectus noster.[1] Hunc autem contingit

I RESPOND: For the understanding of the aforesaid it must be noted, that our intellect is a thing perfectible by

considerare tripliciter, scilicet *in se*, vel prout extenditur *ad affectum*, vel prout extenditur *ad opus*. Extenditur autem intellectus per modum dictantis et regulantis. Secundum hunc triplicem statum, quia[2] errare potest, habet triplicem *habitum directivum*. Nam si consideremus intellectum *in se*, sic est proprie speculativus et perficitur ab habitu, qui est contemplationis gratia, qui[3] dicitur *scientia speculativa*. Si autem consideremus ipsum ut natum extendi *ad opus*, sic perficitur ab habitu, qui est, ut boni fiamus; et hic est *scientia practica* sive moralis. Si autem medio modo consideretur ut natus[4] extendi *ad affectum*, sic perficitur ab habitu medio inter pure speculativum et practicum, qui complectitur utrumque; et hic habitus dicitur *sapientia*, quae simul dicit cognitionem et affectum: *Sapientia enim doctrinae est secundum nomen eius*, Ecclesiastici sexto.[5] Unde hic est contemplationis gratia, et ut boni fiamus, principaliter tamen, ut boni fiamus.

science.[1] But one happens to consider this in a threefold manner, that is *in itself*, and/or as far as it is extended *to affection*, and/or as far as it is extended *to work*. But the intellect is extended through a manner of dictating and regulating. According to this threefold state, because[2] it can err, it has a threefold *directive habit*. For if we were to consider the intellect *in itself*, it is thus properly speculative and is perfected by a habit, which is for the sake of contemplation, which[3] is called *speculative science*. But if we were to consider it as born to be extended *to work*, it is thus perfected by a habit, which is, that we become good; and this is *practical science* or moral (science). But if we were to consider (it) in a middle manner as born[4] to be extended *to affection*, it is thus perfected by a middle habit, between the purely speculative and practical, which comprises both; and this habit is called *wisdom*, which he calls simultaneously cognition and affection: *For wisdom is of doctrine according to its name*, in the sixth (chapter) of Ecclesiaticus.[5] Whence this (habit) is for the sake of contemplation, and that we become good, however principally, that we become good.

Talis est cognitio tradita in hoc libro. Nam cognito haec iuvat fidem, et fides sic est in intellectu, ut, quantum est de sui ratione, nata sit movere affectum.[6] Et hoc patet. Nam haec cognitio, quod Christus pro nobis mortuus est, et consimiles, nisi sit homo peccator et durus, movet ad amorem; non sic ista: quod diameter est asymeter costae.[7]

Such is the cognition handed down in this book. For this cognition helps faith, and faith is so in the intellect, that, as much as it concerns it own reckoning, it has been born to move the affection.[6] And this is clear. For this cognition, that Christ died on our behalf, and the like, unless a man be a sinner and hard (of heart), moves towards love; not so those things: that the diameter is the asymmeter of the side.[7]

Concendendum ergo, quod est, ut boni fiamus.

Therefore it must be conceded, that it is (for this), that we become good.

1. Quod obiicitur, quod[8] est ad pandendum abscondita; dicendum, quod ibi non est status, quia illa revelatio ordinat ad affectum.

1. Because it is objected, that[8] it is for laying open things hidden away; it must be said, that that [ibi] is not a state, because that revelation orders towards affection.

2. 3. Quod obiicitur, quod non est de moribus nec de his quae sunt ab opere nostro; iam patet

2. 3. Because it is objected, that it does not concern morals nor these

responsio ad illud,[9] quia ipse loquitur de illa quae proprie est, ut boni fiamus, ut de practica.

things which are by our work; the reply to that is already clear,[9] because this is said of that which is properly, that we become good, as (is) practical (science).

SCHOLION.

I. Haec questio communiter sic proponitur: utrum theologia sit speculativa, an practica? Attamen, stricte loquendo, inter hunc et illum loquendi modum est differentia. Nam *proprie practica* est notitia, quae per se est ordinabilis ad *operationem*; et in hoc sensu S. Doctor negat, theologiam esse practicam (ad 2. et 3.). Sed ut *boni fiamus* per directionem ad *finem ultimum* sive per inflammationem affectus, hoc inter speculativas scientias proprissime convenit theologiae.

II. In corp. tangitur quaestio inter scholasticos agitata, utrum theologia sit *spaientiae*, quod communiter affirmatur, cfr. Alex. Hal., S. p. I. a. 1. m. 1. — Scot., I. Sent. Prolog. q. 3. — S. Thom., I. Sent. Prolog. a. 1. q. 3; S. I. q. 1. a. 6. — B. Albert., I. Sent. d. 1. a. 4. ad 1. — Richard. a Med., I. Sent. Prolog. q. 5. ad 3. — Aegid. R., I. Sent. Prolog. p. 2. q. 1. — Petr. a Tar., I. Sent. Prolog. q. 1. — Henr. Gand., S. A. 6. q. 2. — Durand., I. Sent. Prolog. q. 1. in fine.

III. In ipsa solutione quaestionis cum Seraphico Doctore et re et modo loquendi conveniunt Alex. Hal., B. Albert., Petr. a Tar., Aegid. R., Thom. de Argentine. S. Thom. in Commentar. in Sent. loco infra cit. simpliciter dicit: Ergo (scientia sacra) non est practica, sed speculativa; in Summa vero: Comprehendit sub se utrumque, magis vero est speculativa quam practica. Haec ultima solutio parum distat a doctrina Seraphici, quod patet sic.

SCHOLIUM

I. This question is commonly proposed thus: whether theology is practical or speculative? But strictly speaking, however, there is a difference between this and that manner of speaking. For *properly practical* is the knowledge [notitia], which is per se ordainable to *operation*; and in this sense the Seraphic Doctor denies, that theology is practical (reply to n. 2 and 3). But that *we become good* through direction to *the last end* or through an enkindling of the affection, among the speculative sciences this most properly belongs to theology.

II. In the body there is touched upon the question debated among the scholastics, whether theology is *wisdom*, which is commonly affirmed, cf. Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I., a. 1, m. 1. — (Bl.) John Duns Scotus, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., q. 3. — St. Thomas., Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., a. 1, q. 3; Summa., I., q. 1, a. 6. — Bl. (now St.) Albert the Great, Sent., Bk. I, d. 1, a. 4, ad 1. — Richard of Middletown, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., q. 5, ad 3. — Giles the Roman, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., p. 2, q. 1. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., q. 1. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 6. q. 2. — Durandus, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., q. 1. in fine.

III. in this solution of the question both in matter and in manner of speaking Alexander of Hales, Bl. (now St.) Albert the Great, (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, Giles the Roman and Thomas of Argentina agree with the Seraphic Doctor. St. Thomas in his Commentary on the Sentences, in the passage cited below, says simply: Therefore (sacred science) is not practical, but speculative; but in the Summa (says) : It comprehends beneath itself both, but it is more speculative than practical. This last solution is not far from the doctrine of

the Seraphic Doctor, which is thus clear.

---

[1] Hoc est, intellectus est subiectum aptum perfici a scientia. — Vat., refragantibus mss. et ed. 1. ponendo *perfectibilis* transponit verba *a scientia* post *noster*.
[2] Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1, transponendo *quia* cum praefixa praticula *et*, in principio huius propositionis aliqualiter respectum considerationis immutat. — Mox cod. X *perfectum* pro *directivum*, et plures codd. ut C F G L R S etc corrupte *ductivum*.
[3] Vat. minus bene *quae*. Simile recurrit in sequenti propositione, in qua Vat. habet *haec* pro *hic*; utrobique tamen contra maiorem partem mss. ut A C F G H K M P Q S T U W Z cc ee ff et ed. 1.
[4] Codd. K et Z, sicuti in praecedentibus, *consideremus ut natum*. — Mox ex mss. et ed. 1, 2, 3, 6 castigavimus mendum Vat. legentis *effectum* pro *affectum*.
[5] Vers. 23, ubi Vulgata transponit *est* post *nomen*. — Sensus est: sapientia secundum etymologiam tempore S. Doctoris communiter receptam idem est ac *sapida scientia*, sive *scientia*, quae dat *saporem*. Cfr. Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 1. m. 1; S. Bonav., III. Sent. d. 35. q. 1. — Paulo supra ante *simul* Vat. contra fere omnes codd. et ed. 1 *quia* loco *quae*. — In principio sequentis propositionis sub demonstrativo *hic* subaudi *habitus*; ed. 1 habet *haec*, quod refertur ad *sapientia*. — Mox cod. K cum ed. 1 satis bene *principalius* loco *principaliter*.
[6] Codd. I et T *et fides licet sit in intellectu, tamen quantum est de sui ratione, nata est movere affectum*; lectio non spernenda. — Mox cod. X pro *Et hoc* ponit *Quod sic*. Dein ex fere omnibus mss. ed ed. 1 hic restituimus particulam *quod*, quae deest in Vat., sed modo loquendi Scholasticorum magis congruit; e contra paulo infra post *amorem* expunximus fide mss. et ed. 1 in Vat. addita verba *et devotionem*.
[7] Id est, diameter quadrati est incommensurabilis lateri, quae sententia occurit in IV. Phys. Aristot., ubi iuxta antiquam versionem impressam Venetiis 1489 studio Bernardino de Tridino, textu 120 (ed. Paris c. 12) sic legitur: Quoniam neque quod non est, erit in tempore, ut quaecumque non contingunt aliter esse, sicut diametrum esse lateri symetrum. Et ibidem iuxta translationem arobico-latinam: Ilud quod impossiblie est, ut sit aliter, ut diametrum esse symetrum constae (□□□). Pro quo textu in Vat. habetur *circulus vincit diametrum*, sed obstant codd. et ed. 1.
[8] Subaudi hic et in principio sequentis responsionis: liber iste, vel, scientia praesentis libri.
[9] Vat. contra mss. et sex primas edd., perturbata propositionis constructione, habet *duo ultima* pro *illud*. Immediate post plures codd. ut C G H L O Q etc. minus bene *quod* loco *quia*. — Mox post *illa* supple cum Vat. *scientia*.

[1] That is, the intellect is an apt subject to be perfected by science. — The Vatican text, breaking with the manuscripts and edition 1, has *perfectible* [perfectibilis] in place of *a thing perfectible* [perfectibile].
[2] The Vatican text, not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, by replacing *because* with the prefixed particle *and* at the beginning of this proposition, alters in some respect the point of the statement. — Next codex X has *perfect* in place of *directive*, and very many of the codices as C F G L R S etc. have the corrupted reading *ductive* [ductivum].
[3] The Vatican text has less well *which*. The same recurs in the following proposition, in which the Vatican text has *this* [haec] in place of *this* [hic]. Both ways, however, are contrary to the greater part of the manuscripts as A C F G H K M P Q S T U W Z cc ee ff and ed. 1.
[4] Codices K and Z, as in the preceding, have *we were to consider it as born*. Next from the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3, and 6 we have corrected the mistake in the reading of the Vatican text which has *effect* [effectum] in place of *affection* [affectum]..
[5] Verse 23, where the Vulgate transposes *est* after *nomen* [trans.: this has reference to only the Latin syntax; *its* refers to *wisdom*.] — The sense is: wisdom is, according to received etymology at the time of the Seraphic Doctor, the same thing as *tasty knowledge* [sapida scientia], which gives *a taste*. Cf. Alexander of Hales, <u>Summa.</u>, p. I., q. 1, m. 1; St. Bonaventure, Commentary, Bk. III. d. 35, q. 1. — A little above this, before *simultaneously*, the Vatican text against nearly all the codices and edition one has *because* in place of *which*. In the beginning of the following proposition for the demonstrative *this* understand *habit*; edition 1 has *this*, which refers to *wisdom*. Next codex K with edition 1 has *more principally* in place of *principally* well enough.
[6] Codices I and T have *and faith though it is in the intellect, however as much as concerns its own reckoning, has been born to move the affection*; a reading which is not to be spurned. — Next codex X puts *Which thus* in place of *And this*. Then from nearly all the manuscripts and edition 1 we have here restored the particle *that*, which was lacking in the Vatican text, but is more agreeable to the manner of speaking of the Scholastics; and conversely a little after *love* we have expunged on the testimony of the manuscripts and edition 1 the words added in the Vatican text, *and devotion*.
[7] That is, the diameter of the square is incommensurable with the side, which

sentence occurs in the fourth book of Aristotle's Physics, where according to the ancient version printed at Venice in 1489, edited by Bernardino of Tridino, text. 120 (ch. 12 in the Parisian edition) there is read: And because that which is not, will not be in time, whatever they are, they do not happen to be otherwise, such as "a diameter is symmetrical to the side". And the same according to the Arabic-Latin translation: That which is impossible, to be otherwise, as "a diameter is symmetrical to a side." (□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□). For which text there is had in the Vatican text *a circle conquers a diameter*, but the codices and edition 1 oppose this.

[8] Understand here in the beginning of the following response: that book of his, and/or the science of the present book.

[9] The Vatican text against the manuscripts and the six first editions, having perturbed the construction of the proposition, has *the two last* in place of *that*. Immediately afterwards very many of the codices as C G H L O Q etc. have less well *that* in place of *because*. — Next after *that* supply with the Vatican text *science*.

---

p. 14

1. Uterque admittit praeter scientiam speculativam et practicam tertium membrum, quod simul utrumque continet. Licet Scotus (Prolog. q. 4.) de hac divisione male sentiat, tamen fere ab omibus et rationabiliter admitttur et bene defenditur ab Aegid. Rom. loc. cit. Ita habitus theologicae scientiae, cum sit superiorir ordinis, quia fundatur in principiis fidei, quae imperatur a voluntatre et involvit inclinationem in Deum, videre esse eminenter speculativus et aliquo modo practius; habet enim virtutem et intellectum illuminandi et affectum inflammandi. Unde saltem in sense largo haec scientia potest appellari practica, licet ex parte *obiecti* non immediate dirigat operationem, quia ex parte *finis* de sui ratione inclinat ad amorem Dei. Pro explicatione servire potest III. Sent., d. 23. a. 1. a. 2. in corp.

1. Each admits besides speculative and practical science a third member, which simultaneously contains both. Though (Bl. John Duns) Scotus (Prolog. q. 4) thinks badly of this division, it is however admitted by nearly all and that reasonably and it is well defended by Giles the Roman, loc. cit.. Thus the habit of theological science, since it belongs to a superior order, because it is founded on the principles of (the virtue of) faith, which is commanded by the will and involves an inclination into God, seems to be eminently speculative and in a certain manner practical; for it has virtue for both illuminating the intellect and inflaming the affection. Whence at least in the broad sense this science can be named practical, though on the part of the *object* it does not immediately direct operation, because on the part of the *end* from its own reason it inclines to the love of God. For an explanation one can use (what is said in the Commentary), Bk. III, d. 23, a. 1, q. 2, in the body of the reply.

2. Si S. Thomas dicit, quod theologia sit magis speculativa quam practica, hoc

2. If St. Thomas says, that theology is more speculative than practical, this is true, if it is

verum est, si consideratur ex parte *obiecti*; et hanc rationem etiam S. Bonaventura satis innuit, cum in solut. ad 2. et 3. neget, quod haec scientia sit practica in sensu stricto. Si vero Seraphicus affirmat, quod sit « principaliter, ut boni fiamus », hoc iterum verissimum est, si spectatur eius *finis*, qui certe magis est, ut boni fiamus, quam ut tantum divina speculemur.

considered on the part of the *object*; and St. Bonaventure has sufficiently inclined to this reason, since in the solution to n. 2 and 3 he denies, that this science is practical in the strict sense. But if the Seraphic Doctor affirms, that it is « principally, that we become good », this is again most true, if one looks at its *end*, which it is certainly greater, (namely) that we become good, than that we only gaze upon divine things.

3. S. Bonaventura hic theologiam expresse non nominat scientiam *affectivam*; tamen tertium membrum divisionis, quod speculativum et practicum in se complectitur, non inepte cum B. Alberto aliisque antiquis hoc vocabulo distingui potest, attendendo finem principalem, qui est caritas in affectu. Nam a fine principali aliqua res nomen bene sortiri potest. — De duplici genere cognitionis, scil. speculationis et devotionis, cfr. III. Sent. d. 35. q. 1.

3. St. Bonaventure here expressly does not name theology an *affective* science; however the third member of the division, that it comprises the speculative and practical in itself, cannot, together with Bl. (now St.) Albert the Great and the other ancient authors, be inaptly distinguished by this word, when attending to the principle end, which is charity in the affection. For from the principle end anything can be well named. — Of the twofold genus of cognition, namely, speculation and devotion, cf. the Commentary, Bk. III., d. 35, q. 1.

IV. De tota questione: Alex. Hal., S. P. I. q. 1, m. 1 et 2. — Scot., I. Sent. Prolog. q. 4. — S. Thom., I. Sent. Prolog. q. 1. a. 3; S. I. q. 1. a. 4. — B. Albert., S. p. I. tr. 1. a. 3. m. 3; I. Sent. d. 1. a. 4. — Petr. a Tar., I. Sent. Prolog. a. 4. — Richard. a Med., Prolog. q. 4. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 8. q. 3. et seqq. — Dionys. Carth., I. Sent. prolog. q. 2. — Durand., I. Sent. Prolog. q. 6. — Biel, I. Sent. Prolog. q. 12.

IV. On this whole question: Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I. q. 1, m. 1 et 2. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., q. 4. — St. Thomas, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., q. 1, a. 3; Summa. , I., q. 1, a. 4. — Bl. (now St.) Albert., Summa., p. I, tr. 1, a. 3, m. 3; Sent., Bk. I, d. 1, a. 4. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., a. 4. — Richard of Middletown, Prolog., q. 4. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 8. q. 3 ff.. — (Bl.) Denis the Carthusian, Sent., Bk. I, prolog., q. 2. — Durandus, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., q. 6. — (Gabriel) Biel, Sent., Bk. I, Prolog., q. 12.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis

S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio

Cardinal Bishop of Alba & Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on

Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PROEMIUM IN LIBRUM PRIMUM SENTENTIARUM

QUAESTIONES PROEMII

Quaestio IV.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 14-15.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

QUAESTIO IV.

Quae sit causa efficiens sive auctor huius libri.

Postremo ad maiorem evidentiam potest quaeri[1] de causa *efficiente*. Et dicitur fuisse Magister Petrus Lombardus, Parisiense Episcopus. Sed quod non debeat dici *auctor* huius libri, videtur.[2]

1. Ille solus dicendus est auctor libri, qui est doctor sive auctor doctrinae; sed, sicut dicit Augustinus in libro de Magistro:[3] « Solus Christus est doctor » : ergo solus debet dici huius libri auctor.

2. Item, sicut dicit Philosophus in Ethica veteri:[4] « Non quicumque facit grammaticalia vel musicalia, debet dici grammaticus vel musicus, utpote si faciat casu, vel fortuna, vel alio supponente sive dicente »; sed Magister hoc opus composuit ex aliena doctrina, sicut ipse dicit in littera,[5] quod « in hoc opere maiorum exempla doctrinamque reperies »: ergo non debet dici auctor.

Si tu dicis,[6] quod non tantum hic est doctrina Sanctorum, sed etiam sua, ratione cuius debet dici auctor; *contra*: « A maiori et digniori debet fieri denominatio »;[7] sed Magister dicit, quod « paulisper vox sua insonuit, et tunc a paternis limitibus non dicessit »: ergo non deberet iste liber dici esse Magistri.

the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

FOREWORD TO THE FIRST BOOK OF THE SENTENCES

QUESTIONS ON THE FOREWORD

Question 4

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 14-15.
Notes by the Quarrachi Editors.

QUESTION 4

What is the efficient cause or author of this book?

Lastly for greater evidence one can ask[1] concerning the *efficient* cause. And it is said that it was Master Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris. But it seems that he ought not be called the *author* of this book.[2]

1. He alone is to be called the author of a book, who is a teacher or author of doctrine; but, as (St.) Augustine says in the book On the Teacher:[3] « Christ alone is Teacher » therefore He alone ought to be called the author of this book.

2. Likewise, as the Philosopher says in the Old Ethics:[4] « Not everyone who makes (things) grammatical or musical, ought to be called a grammarian and/or musician, as (is the case) if it happens on occasion, by fortune, and/or by another substituting or speaking »; but Master (Peter) composed this work from another's doctrine, as he himself says in (his) text,[5] that « in this work you will find the examples and doctrine of (our) elders » therefore he ought not be called (its) author.

If you say,[6] that this is not only the doctrine of the Saints, but also his own, by which reckoning he ought to be called the author: *on the contrary*: « From the greater and more worthy ought a denomination come to be »;[7] but Master (Peter) says, that « his own voice sounded out a little while, and then did not depart from the limits of (our)

CONTRA: Constat quod Deus hoc opus non scriptsit digito suo, ergo habuit alium, creatum auctorem;[8] sed non est dare alium nisi Magistrum.

Item, si auctoritas Magistri in hac causa recipitur, ipse dicit in littera:[9] « In multo labore et sudore hoc volumen, Deo praestante, compegimus »: ergo videtur, quod ipse fuit auctor praesentis libri.

CONCLUSIO.

Petrus Lombardus, Episcopus Parisiensis, est auctor huius libri.

RESPONDEO: Ad intelligentiam dictorum notandum, quod quadruplex est modus faciendi librum. Aliquis enim scribit aliena,[10] nihil addendo vel mutando; et iste mere dicitur *scriptor*. Aliquis scribit aliena, addendo, sed non de suo; et iste *compilator* dicitur. Aliquis scribit et aliena et sua, sed aliena / tamquam principalia, . . .

fathers »: therefore that book ought not be said to be Master(Peter)'s.

ON THE CONTRARY: It is established that God did not write this book with His finger, therefore it had another, created author;[8] but no other is given except Master (Peter).

Likewise, if the authority of Master (Peter) is received in this case, he himself says in (his) text:[9] « In much labor and sweat, with God as (our) surety, we have compiled this volume »: therefore it seems, that he himself was the author of the present book.

CONCLUSION

Peter Lombard, the Bishop of Paris, is the author of this book.

I RESPOND: For an understanding of the things said, it must be noted, that fourfold is the manner of making a book. For one writes another's (words),[10] by adding and/or changing nothing; and that one is called merely a *writer*. Another writes another's (words), by adding, but not from his own; and that one is called a *compiler*. Another writes both his own words and another', but the other's / as the principle ones, . . .

---

[1] Suffragante nullo codice, Vat., omissis praecedentibus verbis, incipit ab istis: *De causa*.
[2] Vat. adiungit *sic*, quod tamen deest in mss. et sex primis edd.
[3] Colligitur ex c. 14. Cfr. etiam Expos. in Epist. I. S. Ian. Tract. 4.
[4] Verba Aristotelis (II. Ethic. c. 4.) iuxta antiquam translationem in operibus S. Thomae (Parmae 1867) sunt: Vel neque in artibus ita (res) se habet? Contingit enim grammaticum quid facere a casu et alio supposito; tunc igitur grammaticus, si grammaticum quid faciat et grammatice. — Vide supra q. 2. arg. 5 ad opp. — Vat. sola post Ethica omittit *veteri*. — Codd. I L N O V X *vel docente* pro *sive dicente*.
[5] In Prolog. — Ex mss. et sex primis edd. substituimus *sicut* loco *nam* et mox supplevimus omissum *quod*.
[6] Plures codd. A H I K T etc. *dicas*.
[7] Aristot., II. de Anima text. 49. (c. 4.): *A fine appelari omnia iustum est*. Finem autem Aristot. diversis in locis (II. Phys. text. 23. et V. Metaph. text. 3.) dicit esse *optimum rei*. — Verba Magistri mox citata vide infra in Prolog. Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 in prima parte verborum Magistri post *quod* addit *si* et ulutimam eorum partem ita exhibet: *non tamen a paternis limitibus discessit*. Sed notandum, quod S. Doctor saepe saepius verba sive Magistri sive S. Patrum non verbotenus, sed tantum ad sensum recitet. — Mox ex pluribus codd. C F G I K L R S T etc.

[1] With no codex supporting, the Vatican text, having omitted the preceding words, begins from: *of the efficient cause*.
[2] The Vatican text adjoins *this*, which however is lacking in the manuscripts and the six first editions.
[3] This is taken from ch. 14. Cf. also The Exposition on the First Epistle of St. John, Tract 4.
[4] The words of Aristotle (Ethics, Bk. II, ch. 4) according to the ancient translation among the works of St. Thomas (Parma 1867) are: And/or is (a thing) thus held neither in the arts? For does happen that a grammarian makes something by chance and with another substituting; therefore (he is) then a grammarian, if as a grammarian he also makes something grammatical. — See above q. 2. argument 5 in reply. — The Vatican text alone omits *Old*. — Codices I L N O V and X have *and/or teaching* in place of *or speaking*.
[5] In the Prologue. — From the manuscripts and the six first editions we have substituted *as* in place of *for* and next we have supplied the omitted *that*.
[6] Very many codices A H I K T etc. have *you may say*.
[7] Aristotle, On the Soul, Bk. II, text 49 (ch. 4): *From (their) end it is just that all things be named*. Moreover Aristotle in diverse places (Physics, Bk. II, text 23 & Metaphysics, Bk. V, text 3) calls the end the *best (part) of a thing*. — For the words of Master (Peter) cited next, see below in the Prologue. The Vatican text, against the testimony of the manuscripts and edition 1, in the first part of the

deberet posuimus pro *debet*.
[8] Vat. cum recentiori cod. cc, omisso *creatam*, non bene habet *doctorem* pro *auctorem*, antiquioribus mss. et. ed. 1 reluctantibus.
[9] In Prologo; vide infra. — In prima propositione huius argument post *Item* ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus *si* et dein substituimus *causa* pro *parte*, quae lectio iam ex isto adagio: Nemo in propria causa est iudex, praeferenda videtur. — Mox post *recipitur* in Vat. additur *ideo cum*, quod abest a mss. et ed. 1.
[10] Vat. et recentior cod. cc non cohaerenter cum consequentibus habent *alienam materiam*, obnitentibus antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1.

words of Master (Peter) adds *if* after *that* and exhibits the last part of them thus: *he does not, however, depart from the limits of the Fathers*. But it must be noted, that the Seraphic Doctor much more often cites either the words of Master (Peter) or of the holy Fathers not word-for-word, but only according to (their) sense. — Next from very many of the codices C F G I K L R S and T etc. we have put *ought* [deberet] in place of *ought* [debet].
[8] The Vatican text together with the more recent codex cc, having omitted *created*, has the not so well *teacher* in place of *author*, in disagreement with the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1.
[9] In the Prologue; v. infra.. — In the first proposition of this argument we have inserted *if* from the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 and then we have substituted *case* in place of *part* [parte], which reading now seems to be preferred, according to that adage: No one is a judge in his own case. [Trans.: the Latin, parte, is a just-as-suitable, classical usage.] — Next after *is received* in the Vatican text there is added *for that reason since*, which is absent from the manuscripts and edition 1.
[10] The Vatican text and the more recent codex cc, incoherently with what follows, have *another's matter*, with the firm opposition of the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1.

---

p. 15

tamquam principalia, et sua tamquam annexa ad evidentiam; et iste dicitur *commentator*, non auctor.[1] Aliquis scribit et a sua et aliena, sed sua tanquam principalia, aliena tamquam annexa ad confimationem; et talis debet dici *auctor*. Talis fuit Magister, qui[2] sententias suas ponit et Patrum sententiis confirmat. Unde vere debet dici auctor huius libri.

as the principles one, and his won as those annexed for evidence; and that one is called a *commentator*, not an author.[1] Another writes both his own and another's, but his own as the principle ones, the other's as things annexed for confirmation; and such ought to be called an *author*. Such was Master (Peter), who[2] put (forth) his own sentences and confirms the sentences of the Fathers. Whence he truly ought to be called the author of this book.

1. Quod ergo obiicitur, quod solus Christus est doctor et auctor; dicendum, quod sicut dicit Augustinus in libro de Doctrina chirstiana,[3] docere est dupliciter, sicut dicitur dupliciter aliquis facere videre. Aliter enim facit videre qui visum restituit, aliter, qui visibile digito ostendit; et[4] primum facit Deus, secundum homo. Similiter aliter docet qui scientiam, quam habet in anima,[5] verbo vel scripto offert vel ostendit, aliter, qui habitum scientiae imprimit; uterque tamen dicitur doctor et auctor, sed Deus principalius; sic[6] in proposito.

1. Therefore because it is objected, that Christ alone is Teacher and Author; it must be said, that as (St.) Augustine says in the book On Christian Doctrine,[3] teaching is twofold, as anyone is said in a twofold manner to cause seeing. For in one way he causes seeing who has restored sight, another way, he who shows the visible thing with (his) finger; and[4] God does the first, man the second. Similarly in one way he teaches, who offers and/or shows the science, which he has in (his) soul,[5] (to others) by word and/or writing, in another, he who impresses the habit of science; each, however, is called a teacher and author, but God more principally; so[6] in the

proposed (objection).

2. Quod obiicitur, quod fecit[7] librum, alio supponente; dicendum, quod non ideo dicitur facere aliquis, supponente alio, quia[8] ab alio didicit — tunc enim pauci essent doctores vel grammatici — sed si omnino scientia eius dependet ab alio, ita quod non habet habitum intra, sicut illi qui faciunt bonum latinum, quia alii eis[9] dixerunt, sed ipsi ignorant artem; hoc modo non fuit Magister. Nam a scientia, quam acquisierat longo tempore vel labore, hoc opus composuit et per doctrinas Patrum suas sententias[10] confirmavit. Et quod sunt ibi multa dicta aliorum, hoc non tollit Magistro auctoritatem, sed potius eius auctoritatem confirmat[11] et humilitatem commendat.

2. Because it is objected, that he made[7] the book, with another substituting; it must be said, that no one for that reason is said to make, with another substituting, because[8] he has learned from another — for then few would be teachers and/or grammarians — but if his science depends entirely on another, so that he does not have the habit inside, as those who write good Latin, because others have told them,[9] but themselves are ignorant of the art; in this manner Master (Peter) was not (the author). For by the science, which he had acquired over a long time and/or with labor, he composed this work and through the doctrines of the Fathers confirmed his own sentences[10]. And because there are many things said there by others, this does not take away from the Master's authority, but rather confirms his authority[11] and commends (his) humility.

---

[1] Sequimur codd. R T X ee addendo *non auctor*, quae lectio et ex se et ex subnexis probatur, in super ex falsa lectione multorum codd. ut A B F H I M V W Y Z aa bb cc ff cum ed. 1 *et auctor* confirmatur.
[2] Fide mss. et ed. 1 mutavimus *quoniam* in *qui*. Mox plures codd. ut F H I O T U aa et ed. 1 *per Patrum sentientias*.
[3] In Prooemio, ubi haec Augustini sententia quoad sensum verborum invenitur.
[4] In Vat. deest particula *et* a mss. ed ed. 1 exhibita.
[5] Falsam lectionem Vat. et cod. cc *alium* pro *anima* emendamus ope aliorum mss. et ed. 1.
[6] Substituimus ex codd. D F H R aa ee et ed. 1 *sic* loco *sicut*; quae lectio sincerior nobis videtur eo , quod per particulam *sic* applicatio generalium principiorum in praecedentibus nondum facta, sed iam facienda melius indicatur. Codd. D ee et ed. 1 addunt *est*.
[7] Subaudi: Magister.
[8] Codd. B C D G H K O S U V ee ff cum ed 1 *qui* pro *quia*, cod. A *quae*, sed non bene propter superius positum *non ideo*. Paulo post Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1 *dependeat* pro *dependet* et *habeat* loco *habet*.
[9] Lapsum librariorum in Vat. *ei* pro *eis* emendavimus; paulo post reposuimus *fuit* loco *fecit librum istum* auctoritate mss. et ed. 1.
[10] Codd. F O X *per doctrinas et Patrum sententias*; lectio non spernenda, a qua codd. H S V et ed. 1 in eo tantum discedunt, quod omittant particulam *et*. Cod. R *per catholicas Patrum sententias*.
[11] Non ita bene Vat. cum recentiori cod. cc omittit *confirmat*, quod tamen in antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 habetur.

---

[1] We follow codices R T X and ee by adding *not an author*, which reading is proved both from itself and from what follows, as is confirmed besides from the false reading of many of the codices as A B F H I M V W Y Z aa bb ee and ff together with edition 1, which have *also an author*.
[2] Trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1 we have changed *since* into *who*. Next very many of the codices as F H I O T U aa and edition 1 have *through the sentences of the Fathers*.
[3] In the Foreword, where this sentence of (St.) Augustine is found in regard to its sense.
[4] In the Vatican text the particle *and*, present in the manuscripts and edition 1, is lacking.
[5] The false reading of the Vatican text and codex cc, which have *in another* in place of *in (his) soul*, we emend with the help of the other manuscripts and edition 1.
[6] We have substituted from codices D F H R aa ee and edition 1 *so* in place of *as*; which reading seems to us more sincere for this, that by the particle *so* an application of general principles in the preceding matters has not yet been made, but now a better way for it to be done is indicated.
[7] Understand here: Master (Peter).
[8] Codices B C D G H K O S U V ee and ff together with edition 1 have *who* in place of *because*, codex A has *which*, but this is not good on account of the above placed *for that reason . . . not*. A little afterwards the Vatican text, against the manuscripts and edition 1, has *depends* [dependeat] for *depends* [dependet] and *have* [habeat] for *have* [habet].
[9] The lapsus of the copyist in the Vatican text *ei* for *eis* we have emended; a little afterwards we have replaced *was . . . (author)* instead of *made that book*

on the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1.
[10] Codices F O and X have *through the doctrines and sentences of the Fathers*; a reading not to be spurned, from which only codices H S V and edition 1 depart in this, that they omit the particle *and*. Codex R has *through the catholic sentences of the Fathers* [trans.: i.e. through their unanimous opinions].
[11] Not so well does the Vatican text together with codex cc omit *confirms*, which is, however, had in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1.

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quarrachi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation that that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator.

Magistri Petri Lombardi

Arch. Episc. Parisiensis

Sententiarum Quatuor Libri

LIBER PRIMUS SENTENTIARUM.

DE DEI UNITATE ET TRINITATE

PROLOGUS IN LIBROS SENTENTIARUM.[1]

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 16-22.
Cum Notitiis Editorum Quarrachi

Cupientes aliquid de penuria ac tenuitate nostra cum paupercula in gazophylacium Domini mittere,[2] ardua scandere, opus ultra vires nostras agere praesumsimus, consummationis fiduciam laborisque mercedem in Samaritano[3] statuentes, qui, prolatis in curationem semivivi duobus denariis, supereroganti cuncta redere professus est. Delectat nos veritas pollicentis, sed terret immensitas laboris: desiderium hortatur proficiendi, sed dehortatur infirmitas deficiendi, quam vincit zelus domus Dei. « Quo[4] inardescentes, fidem nostram adversus errores carnalium atque animalium hominum » Davidicae turris clypeis munire vel potius munitam ostendere ac theologicarum inquisitionum abdita aperire nec non et sacramentorum ecclesiaticorum pro modico[5] intelligentiae nostrae notitiam traducere studuimus, « non valentes studiosorum fratrum votis iure

Master Peter Lombard

Archbishop of Paris

The Four Books of Sentences

THE FIRST BOOK OF THE SENTENCES

ON THE UNITY AND TRINITY OF GOD

PROLOGUE TO THE BOOKS OF SENTENCES.[1]

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 16-22.
Notes by the Quarrachi Editors.

Desiring with the poor woman to place something from our penury and meagerness into the guardhouse of the Lord's treasury,[2] (and) to scale (its) steep (steps), we have presumed to do a work beyond our strength, placing (our) trust in (its) consummation and recompense in the Samaritan's labors,[3], who, having offered two denarii to care for the half-alive man, professed to render the rest to the one paying out more. The truth of the One proffering delights us, but the immensity of the labor frightens: the desire of making progress exhorts, but the infirmity of failing discourages, which (infirmity) zeal for the house of God conquers. « Catching fire from this (zeal),[4] our faith against the errors of carnal and animal men » we have studied to wall with the round shields of the Tower of David and/or to show rather that (it is) walled and to open those things withdrawn

resistere, eorum in Christo laudabilibus studiis lingua ac stilo nos servire flagitantium, quas bigas in nobis agitat Christi caritas ».[6]

from theological inquiries and also to put on display [traducere] the knowledge of ecclesiastical sacraments to the limited extent[5] of our understanding, « not prevailing to resist lawfully the resolute wishes [votis] of the studious brothers, to serve the laudable studies in Christ of those entreating (us) with tongue and stylus, which as a chariot in us the charity of Christ puts in motion ».[6]

« Quamvis[7] non ambigamus, omnem humani eloquii sermonem calumniae atque contradictioni aemulorum semper fuisse obnoxium, quia, dissentientibus voluntatum motibus, dissentiens quoque fit animorum sensus », « ut, cum omne dictum veri ratione perfectum sit, tamen, dum aliud aliis aut videtur aut complacet, veritati vel non intellectae vel offendenti[8] impietatis error obnitatur, ac voluntatis invidia resultet », « quam *Deus huius saeculi operatur* in illis *diffidentiae filiis*,[9] qui non rationi voluntatem subiiciunt nec doctrinae studium impendunt, sed his quae somniarunt sapientiae verba coaptare nituntur, non veri, sed placiti rationem sectantes, quos iniqua voluntas non ad intelligentiam / veritatis, . . .

« Although[7] we do not dispute, that every sermon of human speech has always been obnoxious to the calumny and contradiction of rivals, because, with dissenting movements of wills, the sensing of spirits also becomes dissenting », « so that, although every saying of truth [dictum veri] is perfected by reason, however, while it appears or pleases others differently [aliud aliis], the error of impiety strives against the truth (which is) not understood and/or offending,[8] and there results envy of will », « which *the god of this age works* in those *sons of diffidence*,[9] who do not subject (their) will to reason nor expend (their) study on doctrine, but strive to adapt the words of wisdom with those things for which they are dreaming, seeking not a reason for truth, but for pleasure, whom an iniquitous will incites not towards the understanding / of the truth . . .

---

[1] Editiones et codices, quos contulimus, aut omittunt hanc epigraphem, aut varie exhibent; cumque non sibi constent, nihil est cur in ea aliquid immutemus. Editores Vaticani, editionem 2 secuti, hunc prologum in tres partes diviserunt, singulas singulis titulis distinguentes, at contra fidem omnium codicum nec non aliarum editionum, quorum auctoritate divisionem sustulimus, titulis contractis et in marginem reiectis. Ipse S. Bonaventura in Commentario hunc prologum in duas partes principales dispertit in margine notatas.

[2] Respicitur illud Luc. 21, 2; et Marc. 12, 42. — Mox post verbum *scandere* in sola ed. 8 additur coniunctio *et*.

[3] Alluditur ad Luc. 10, 35.

[4] Haec verba, paucis mutatis vel transpositis a Magistro, ita leguntur apud August. II. de Trin. n. 1: « Pro studio, quo fidem nostram adversus errorem carnalium et animalium hominum muniri inardesco, necesse est me pati ». Omnes codd. et edd. cum Vat. legunt *atque* pro *et*. *Errorem* vero pro *errores* habet cum Augustino etiam ed. 2, quam tamen, contradicentibus omnibus codd. ceterisque edd., sequi non licet, cum perfamiliare fuerit Magistro verba, quae aliunde accipit, in usum suum mutare, ea per varios casus inflectendo, trasponendo et

[1] The editions and codices, which we have conferred, either omit this epigraph, or exhibit it differently; and since they are not consistent, there is no basis for us to make any change. The editors of the Vatican text, having followed edition 2, divided this prologue into three parts, distinguishing each with its own title—having contracted the titles and left them in the margin—but (this they did) not trusting in all the codices nor in the other editions, by whose authority we have supported the division. St. Bonaventure himself separated this prologue in (his own) Commentary into two principle parts, as noted in the margin.

[2] A reference to Luke 21:2 and Mark 12:42. Immediately after the word *scale* [scandere], there is added in edition 8 alone, the conjunction *and* [et].

[3] An allusion to Luke 10:35.

[4] These words, having been changed a little and/or transposed by Master (Peter), are thus read in Augustine's On the Trinity, Bk. II, n. 1: « On behalf of the study, by which I am catching fire to wall our faith against the error of carnal and animal men, it is necessary that I suffer » All the codices and editions together with the Vatican text read *and also* [atque] for *and* [et]. But even edition 2 has *error* [error] in place of *errors* [errores] together with Augustine,

minuendo, vel de suo alia interponendo et addendo. Quod non semel lectoribus observandi occasionem dabimus.

[5] Cod. B cum omnibus edd. legit *pro modulo*, refragantibus Codd. A C D E cum aliis plurimis, quod Florentiae et Pataviae consuluimus. In cod. D manus altera saeculi XV. scripsit ad marginem *pro modulo*: glossema, quod forte in aliis mss. a margine in textum irrepsit et inde in editis obtinuit.

[6] August. loc. cit. « . . . fratribus autem non valeam resistere, iure, quo eis servus factus sum, flagitantibus, ut eorum in Christo laudabilibus studiis lingua ac stilo meo, quas bigas in me caritas agitat, maxime serviam ».

[7] Hilar. de Trin. libr. x. n. 1: « Non est ambiguum, omnem humani eloquii sermonem contradictioni obnoxium semper fuisse: quia dissentientibus voluntatum motibus, dissentiens quoque fit sensus animorum; cum adversantium affectione compugnans, assertionibus his, quibus offenditur, contradicit. Quamvis enim omne dictum veri ratione perfectum sit, tamen, dum aliud aliis aut videtur, aut complacet, patet veritatis sermo adversantium reponsioni: quia contra veritatem aut non intellectam aut offendentem vel stultae vel vitiosae voluntatis error obnititur. Immoderata enim est omnis susceptarum voluntatum pertinacia; et indeflexo motu adversandi studium persistit, ubi non rationi voluntas subiicitur nec studium doctrinae impenditur, sed his quae volumus rationem conquirimus, et his quae studemus doctrinam coaptamus. Iamque nominis potius quam naturae erit doctrina, quae fingitur: et non iam veri manebit ratio, sed placiti, quam sibi voluntas magis ad defensionem placentium coaptaverit, non quae voluntatis instinctum per intelligentiam veri rationabilis incitabit ». Dein post verba *placentium incitat*, totidem omissis quot attulit, sequentia usque ad *foedere bellant* ex eodem Hilario ibidem n. 2. passim excerpsit Magister. Tum ad Hilar. n. 1. rediens, ut pauca illa: *Inter veri namque* usque *tuetur*, accipiat, ubique pro more suo etiam in iis, quae accipit, aliquid demit, mutat interpolatque.

[8] Vat. male et contra codd. et fere omnes edd. addit *et* ante *impietatis*, et mox legit *obnititur* et *resultat*.

[9] II. Cor. 4, 4. et Eph. 2, 2. — Vat. *saeculi huius* pro *huius saeculi*, sed renitentibus omnibus mss. cum edd. 1, 8 atque ipso sacro textu, et mox post *filiis* adiungit *suis* contra codd. et edd. omnes et ipsam Vulgatam, ubi legitur: *operatur in filios diffidentiae*.

which (edition), however, having contradicted all the codices and the other editions, is not licit to follow, since it was a thoroughly familiar thing to Master (Peter) to change the words, which he accepted from another, for his own use, by inflecting, transposing and lessening them through various cases, and/or interposing and adding others of his own. Which we shall give the readers occasion for observing more than once.

[5] Codex B with all the editions reads *to the small measure* [pro modulo], breaking with codices A C D and E together with many others, which we have consulted at Florence and Padua. In codex D another hand in the 15th century wrote on the margin *to the small measure* [pro modulo]: a gloss, which perhaps crept into the text from the margin in other manuscripts and from there was retained in the editions.

[6] St. Augustine loc. cit.: « . . . but I may not prevail in resisting the brothers, lawfully, from this that I have been made their servant, entreating (me as they do), to serve most of all their laudable studies in Christ with my tongue and stylus, which as a chariot in me charity puts in motion ».

[7] St. Hilary (of Poitiers), On the Trinity, Bk. X, n. 1: « There is no dispute, that every sermon of human speech has always been obnoxious to contradiction: because with dissenting movements of wills, the sensing of spirits also becomes dissenting; since being pricked by the affection of adversaries, it contradicts those assertions, by which it is offended. For although every saying of truth is made perfect by reason, however, so long as it either appears, or pleases, others differently [aliud aliis], the sermon of the truth lies open to the response of adversaries: because against the truth, either not understood or offending, the error of the foolish and/or vicious will strives. For unmeasured is every pertinacity of the wills that have undertaken (such things); and by an undeflected movement a study to resist [adversandi] persists, where a will is not subjected to reason nor study spent on doctrine, but we seek out a reason for those things which we want, and we adapt doctrine with those things for which we strive [studemus]. And hence [iam] in name [nominis] rather than in reality [naturae] will be the doctrine, which is fashioned: and there will remain no longer a reason for truth, but for pleasure, which (reason) one's own will has adapted more for the defense of pleasant things, which the instinct of a will will not incite through the understanding of a reasonable truth ». Then after the words *pleasant things* [placentium incitat], having omitted as much as he quotes, Master (Peter) copies the passage up to *against the truth* [foedere bellant] from the same Hilary ibid. n. 2 ff.. Then returning to St. Hilary, n. 1, those few (words): *For between the assertion* [Inter veri namque] up to *guards itself* [tuetur], he accepts, everywhere as is his custom even in those things, which he accepts, he subtracts, changes and interpolates something.

[8] The Vatican text, against both the codices and nearly all the editions, adds badly *and* [et] before *of impiety* [impietatis], and then has the indicative for

strives [obnititur] and *results* [resultat].
.[9] 2 Cor. 4:4 and Eph. 2:2. — The Vatican text has *of age this* [saeculi huius] in place of *of this age* [huius saeculi], but all the manuscripts together with editions 1 and 8 and the Sacred Text itself oppose this, and then at *sons* [fillis] it adds *his own* [suis] against the codices and all the editions and the Vulgate itself, where there is read: *works in sons of diffidence* [operator in filios diffidentiae].

---

p. 17

veritatis, sed ad defensionem[1] placentium incitat, non desiderantes doceri veritatem, sed ab ea *ad fabulas convertentes auditum*.[2] Quorum professio est magis placita quam docenda conquirere nec docenda desiderare, sed desideratis doctrinam coaptare. *Habent rationem sapientiae in superstitione*:[3] quia fidei defectionem sequitur hypocrisis mendax, ut sit vel[4] in verbis pietas, quam amiserit conscientiae, ipsamque simulatam pietatem omni[5] verborum mendacio impiam reddunt, falsae doctrinae institutis fidei sanctitatem corrumpere molientes auriumque pruriginem sub novello sui desiderii dogmate aliis ingerentes, qui contentioni studentes contra veritatem sine foedere bellant ». « Inter veri namque assertionem et placiti defensionem pertinax pugna est, dum se et[6] veritas tenet, et se voluntas erroris tuetur ». Horum igitur et[7] Deo odibilem ecclesiam evertere atque ora oppilare, ne virus nequitiae in alios effundere queant, et lucernam veritatis in candelabro exaltare volentes,[8] in labore multo ac sudore hoc volumen, Deo praestante, compegimus ex testimoniis veritatis in aeternum fundatis, in quatuor libros distinctum.

of the truth, but to the defense[1] of pleasant things, not desiring to be taught the truth, but *converting themselves* away from it *towards the hearing of fables*.[2] Whose profession is more a pleasantry [placita] than a seeking out of things to be taught, and not a desiring of things to be taught, but an adapting of doctrine with things desired. *They have a reason for (their) wisdom in superstition*:[3] because mendacious hypocrisy follows defection from the faith, so that even[4] in (their) words there is a piety, which has lost (its) conscience, and they render that simulated piety impious with every[5] mendacity of words, contriving to corrupt the sanctity of the Faith with the instructions of false doctrine and forcing upon others an itching of the ears under the novel dogma of their own desire, who as students of contention war without the restraint of treaties [sine foedere] against the truth ». « For between the assertion of truth and the defense of pleasure there is a persistent battle, so long as both[6] the truth grasps itself and the will for error guards itself ». Therefore lest they be able to pour forth the venom of their iniquity upon others, to both[7] turn the Church into (something) hateful to God and to stop up mouths of these (Her sons), we willing[8] to exalt the light of the truth upon a candlestick, in much labor and sweat, with God as (our) surety, have compiled this volume in four distinct books, from the testimonies of the truth founded in eternity.

In quo maiorum exempla doctrinamque reperies,[9] in quo per dominicae fidei sinceram professionem vipereae doctrinae fraudulentiam prodidimus, aditum demonstrandae veritatis complexi nec periculo impiae professionis inserti,[10]

In which you shall again find[9] the examples and doctrine of (our) elders, (and) in which we have brought to light through a sincere profession of faith in the Lord [dominicae fidei] the fraudulence of the viper's doctrine,

temperato inter utrumque moderamine utentes. Sicubi vero parum vox nostra insonuit,[11] non a paternis dicessit limitibus. « Non igitur debet hic labor cuiquam pigro vel multum docto videri superfluus, cum multis impigris multisque indoctis, inter quos etiam mihi, sit necessarius »,[12] brevi volumine complicans Patrum sententias, appositis eorum testimoniis, ut non sit necesse quaerenti librorum numerositatem evolvere, cui brevitas collecta[13] quod quaeritur offert sine labore. « In hoc autem tractatu non solum pium lectorem, sed etiam liberum correctorem desidero, maxime ubi profunda versatur veritatis quaestio, quae utinam tot haberet inventores, quot habet contradictores ».[14] Ut autem quod quaeritur facilius occurrat, titulos, quibus singulorum librorum capitula distinguuntur, praemisimus.

have embraced an approach for demonstrating the truth and have not inserted[10] the danger of an impious profession, using a temperate means of guidance among both. But if our voice has sounded out at little anywhere,[11] it has not departed from the limits of the Fathers. « Therefore this labor ought not seem superfluous to anyone learned sluggishly or much, since for many diligent and many unlearned (men), among whom even for myself, it is necessary »,[12] that one compile the sentences of the Fathers in a brief volume, with their appropriate testimonies, so that it is not necessary for one to seek to unroll numerous books, for whom a brief collection [brevitas collecta][13] offers what is sought without the labor. « Moreover in this tract I not only desire the pious reader, but also the free [i.e. unrestrained] corrector, most of all where a profound question of the truth is dealt with, which, one would wish, would have as many discoverers, as it has contradictors ».[14] Moreover so that what is sought may more easily come to meet (the reader), we have prefaced (this work with) the titles, by which the chapters of each of the books is distinguished.

---

[1] Solus cod. E hic addit *sibi*.
[2] II. Tim. 4, 4.
[3] Coloss. 2, 33; Vulgata: Quae sunt rationem quidem habentia in supersitione. Ceterae edd. et omnis codd. relativum *quae* supprimunt eiusque loco punctum ferunt post *coaptare*, dum Vat. ed ed. 4 legunt *coaptare, quae habent*.
[4] Vat. omittit *vel*, quod restituimus ex Hilario, ex omnibus codd. et edd., excepta 4. Mox pro *amiserit* legitur *amisit* in cod. D et *amiserat* in ed. 2. Utrumque respuunt cum Hilario ceteri codd. et edd.
[5] Codd. A B E et edd. 1, 8 male *omnium* pro *omni*.
[6] Codd. D E hic male praetermittunt praticulam *et*.
[7] Solus cod. D cum edd. 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9 omittit *et*. Utraque lectio bona, sed facilior sine *et*.
[8] Respicitur Matth. 5, 15. — Mox deest *hoc* in codd. A B C et in edd. 1, 8. Deinde codd. D F *et quatuor libris* pro *in quatuor libris*.
[9] Cod. E *invenies*.
[10] Solummodo Vat. et ed. 4 *incerti* pro *inserti*.
[11] Edd. 2, 9, 10 *insonuerit*. Tum cod. B bene post *non* adiungit *tamen*; deinde cod. A *liminibus* pro *limitibus*.
[12] Ex August. de Trin. III. n. 1, quibusdam omissis et nonnullis additis; in quo textu superflue et contra originale codd. A B D E cum edd. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 post *etiam* addunt *et*.
[13] In Vat. ac edd. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 nec non cod. A desideratur *collecta*. Paulo ante legitur *revolvere* pro *evolvere* in ed. 1.

---

[1] Only codex E reads *of the things pleasant to themselves* [sibi placentium].
[2] 2 Tim. 4:4.
[3] Col. 2:33; in the Vulgate: Which are indeed possessing a reason in superstition. The rest of the editions and all the codices suppress the relative *which* [quae] and in its place put a period after *desired* [coaptare], while the Vatican text and edition 4 reads *desired, which have* [coaptare, quae habent].
[4] The Vatican text omits the *even* [vel], which we have restored from St. Hilary, as quoted in all the codices and editions, excepting n. 4. Then for *has lost* [amiserit] codex D reads *has lost* [amisit] and edition 2 *had lost* [amiserat]. The rest of the codices and editions together with St. Hilary reject both of these readings.
[5] Codices A B and E and editions 1 and 8, have badly *with mendacity of all words* [omnium verborum mendacio] for *with every mendacity of words* [omni verborum mendacio].
[6] Codices D and E wrongly repeat *and* [et] at this point.
[7] Only codex D with editions 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 9 omit *both* [et] here. Both readings are good, but it is easier to read without the *both* [et: since the parallel construction of <u>et . . .et</u> normally does not use <u>atque</u> as a substitute, as is done here].
[8] A reference to Mt. 5:15. — Then *this* [hoc] is lacking in codices A B and C and in editions 1 and 8. Then

[14] Paulo aliter apud August. ibid. n. 2, cuius integer locus, cum sit brevis, describitur: Sane cum in omnibus litteris meis non solum pius lectorem, sed etiam liberum correctorem disederem, multo maxime in his, ubi ipsa magnitudo quaestionis, utinam tam multos inventores habere posset, quam multos contradictores habet.

codices D and F have *and by four books* [et quatuor libris] in place of *in four books* [in quatuor libris].
[9] Codex E has *you shall find* [invenies].
[10] Only the Vatican text and edition 4 have *uncertain* [incerti] here in place of *inserted* [inserti].
[11] Editions 2, 9 and 10 have *will have sounded out* [insonuerit]. Then codex B does well to add *however* [tamen] after *not* [non].
[12] From St. Augustine's On the Trinity, Bk. III, n. 1, with certain words omitted and not a few added; in which text codices A B D and E together with editions 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7 superfluously, and contrary to the original, add *and* [etiam] before *even* [et].
[13] In the Vatican text and editions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9 and also in codex A *collection* [collecta] is lacking. A little before this edition 1 has *revolve* [revolvere] in place of *unroll* [evolvere].
[14] In St. Augustine's text, ibid., n. 2, this appears slightly different: Since in all my letters I would reasonably desire not only the pious reader, but also the unrestrained corrector, most of all in those, where the very magnitude of the question, could, one would wish, have as many discoverers, as it has many contradictors.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

COMMENTARIUS IN PROLOGUM MAGISTERI

DIVISIO TEXTUS AC DUBIA

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 22-25.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

DIVISIO TEXTUS

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba & Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

COMMENTARY ON THE PROLOGUE OF MASTER PETER

DIVISION OF THE TEXT AND DUBIA

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 22-25.
Notes by the Quarrachi Editors.

DIVISION OF THE TEXT

Totali libro praemittit Magister prologum, in quo tangit causas suscepti operis. Dividitur autem in duas partes. In prima parte ponit rationes, quae moverunt[1] ipsum ad aggrediendum praesens negotium sive opus; in secunda rationes, quae debent movere disciplulos ad benigne audiendum, ibi[2] circa finem: *In quo maiorum etc.*, ubi incipit alloqui auditores.

To the entire book Master (Peter) prefaces a prologue, in which he touches upon the causes of undertaking this work. Moreover it is divided into two parts. In the first part he posits the reasons, which moved[1] him to approach [aggrediendum] the present business or work; in the second the reasons, which ought to move students to hear (him) kindly, there[2] near the end: *In which you shall again find etc.* , where he begins to speak to (his) listeners.

Prima pars dividitur iterum in duas, quia duplex ratio potest movere aliquem ad opus faciendum, scilicet *amor boni* et *odium mali*. *Primo* ergo ponit rationes sumtas ex parte *amoris boni*, scilicet catholicae veritatis. *Secundo* ex parte *odii mali*, scilicet haereticae pravitatis, ibi: *Quamvis non ambigamus* etc. Prima pars habet quatuor particulas. In prima tangit[3] causam excitantem; et haec est desiderium mercedis et spes auxilii sub exemplo viduae et parabola Samaritani. In secunda ponit causam retrahentem, quae duplex est, scilicet laboris immensitas et propria infirmitas, ibi: *Delectat nos* etc. In tertia ponit causam ipsum[4] propellentem, et haec est zelus ipsum accendens, ibi: *Quam vincit zelus* etc. In quarta ponit causam compellentem et praevalentem, ibi: *Non valentes* etc., et haec est petitio fratrum studiosorum, quibus non potest quis iure resistere, sed quodammodo necessario oportet collum subiicere.

The first part is divided again into two parts, because a twofold reason can move anyone to do a work, namely the *love of the good* and the *hatred of evil*. *First*, therefore, he posits the reasons taken from the part of the *love of the good*, namely of catholic truth. *Second* from the part of the *hatred of evil*, namely of heretical depravity, there (where he says): *Although we do not dispute* etc.. The first part has four subparts. In the first he touches upon[3] the exciting cause; and this is the desire for recompense and hope for help after the example of the widow and the parable of the Samaritan. In the second he posits the restraining cause, which is twofold, namely the immensity of the labor and his own infirmity, there (where he says): *The truth of the One* etc.. In the third he posits the cause propelling him,[4] and this is the zeal influencing [accedens] him, there (where he says): *Which zeal for the house* etc.. In the fourth he posits the cause compelling and prevailing (upon him), there (where he says): *Not prevailing* etc., and this is the petition of (his) studious brothers, whom one cannot lawfully resist, but (to whom) in a certain, unavoidable [necessario] manner it is proper to submit (one's) neck.

DUBIA CIRCA PRIMAM PARTEM PROLOGI MAGISTRI

DOUBTS ABOUT THE FIRST PART OF THE PROLOGUE OF MASTER PETER

Dub. I.

Sed quaeritur de hoc quod dicit:[5] *Opus agere praesumsimus*; sed praesumtio est peccatum: ergo peccavit.

Doubt I

But (the first doubt) is asked concerning this which he says:[5] *we have presumed to do a work*; but presumption is a sin: therefore he has sinned.

Respondeo: Est praesumtio *confidentiae* de divino adiutorio, et praesumtio *superbiae*, quae est de proprio ingenio. Prima non est

I respond: A presumption of *confidence* concerns divine assistance, and a presumption of *pride* concerns one's own

peccatum, sed est virtutis;[6] secunda vero est peccatum; sed de prima loquitur Magister.

Vel aliter: Est praesumtio secundum *veritatem*, et est praesumtio secundum *propriam aestimation / em*.

ingenuity . The first is not a sin, but is a virtue;[6] but the second is a sin; but Master (Peter) speaks of the first.

And/or in another manner: There is a presumption according to the *truth*, and a presumption according to *one's own estimation*.

---

[1] Cod. I. et ed 1 *movent*.
[2] Supplevimus *ibi*, sicuti et paulo infra post *dividitur* particulam *iterum* ex mss. et ed. 1.
[3] Cod. W et X *ponit*. Mox aliqui codd. ut F G K ee ff cum ed. 1 *hoc est* loco *haec est*, quae lectio adhuc bis in sequentibus occurit, sed non ita bene.
[4] Vat. indebite et contra mss. ac 1 omittit *ipsum*.
[5] Praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 in hoc dubio et in sequentibus Vat. omittit haec verba preambula. Dein Vat. textum Magistri integre exhibet, post *opus* addendo *ultra vires nostras*, quae tamen verba desunt in mss. et ed. 1. Haec omissio et mutatio praeambulorum in omnibus fere dubiis litteralibus totius Commentarii occurrit in Vat., sicut iam in Prolegominis observatum est.
[6] Minus bene et reluctantibus mss. cum ed. 1, hic Vat. addit *indicium*.

[1] Codex I and edition 1 have *move*.
[2] We have supplied *there*, just as also a little below, after *is divided* we have supplied *again*, from the manuscripts and edition 1.
[3] Codex W and X have *posits*. Next some of the codices, as F G K ee and ff, together with edition 1, have *this is* [hoc est] in place of *this is* [haec est], which reading occurs twice more in what follows, but not so well.
[4] The Vatican text unduly, and against the manuscripts and edition 1, omits *him*.
[5] Not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, the Vatican text in this doubt and in the following ones, omits these opening words. Then the Vatican text exhibits the whole passage of Master (Peter), by adding *beyond our strength* after *work*, which words however are lacking in the manuscripts and edition 1. This omission and mutation of the opening words in nearly all the texts of the doubts of the whole Commentary occurs in the Vatican text, as has already been observed in the Prolegomenon.
[6] Less well and with the manuscripts and edition 1 opposing, the Vatican text has here *but is the indication of truth*.

---

p. 23

/ em. Prima est reprehensibilis, quia superbiae, secunda laudabilis, quia humilitatis, nec est culpabilis in aliquo; vir enim humilis in omnibus[1] operibus suis se reputat indignum et quasi praesumtuosum.

The first is reprehensible, because (it belongs) to pride, but the second laudable, because (it belongs) to humility, nor is it culpable in anything; for a humble man in all[1] his works reputes himself unworthy and, as it were, presumptuous.

Dub. II.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Prolatis duobus denariis supererroganti*; quae sit ista supererogatio. *Si tu dicis*, quod sit magistrorum et Sanctorum superadditio ad sacram Scripturam; *contra*, Damascenus:[2] «Quae tradita sunt nobis per Legem et Prophetas veneremur, nihil ultra haec inquirentes ».

Item, Apocalypsis ultimo:[3] *Si quis apposuerit super haec, apponet ei Dominus plagas*.

Doubt II.

Likewise (the second doubt) is asked of this which he says: *having offered two denarii to the one paying out more* [supereroganti]; what is that supererogation? *If you say*, that «it is the masters' and Saints' superaddition to Sacred Scripture; *against* (you is St. John) Damascene:[2] « That which has been handed down to us through the Law and the Prophets we venerate, inquiring nothing beyond these things ».

Likewise, the last (chapter) of the Apocalypse:[3] *If anyone adds upon these (words), the Lord will add to him the plagues . . ..*

RESPONDEO: Dicendum, quod est additio *distrahens* et est additio *complens*. Addens primo modo non supererogat, sed magis diminuit et subvertit; et tales sunt haeretici, quibus datur maledictio. Addens secundo modo supererogat, quia salvo sensu Scripturae[4] ipsam dilucidat. Per *duos* igitur *denarios* duo intelligo Testamenta, per *Samaritanum*, Christum, per *semivivum*, hominem gratuitis expoliatum et vulneratum in naturalibus, per[5] *supererogationem* intelligo doctorem exponentem.

I RESPOND: It must be said, that there is a *distracting* addition and there is a *completing* addition. Adding in the first manner does not supererogate, but rather diminishes and subverts; and such are the heretics, for whom the malediction is given. Adding in the second manner does supererogate, because with the sense of Scripture preserved[4] it makes it shine forth [dilucidat]. Therefore through the *two denarii* I understand two Testaments, by the *Samaritan*, Christ, by *the half-alive,* man despoiled [expoliatum] and wounded in (his) natural gifts [gratuitis], by[5] *supererogation* I understand a teacher expounding (the sense of Scripture).

Vel aliter dicendum, quod est additio, in qua additum est *contrarium*, et est,[6] in qua additum est *diversum*, et est in qua additum est *consonem*. Prima additio est erroris, secunda praesumtionis; quia praesumtio est dicere in sacra Scriptura aliquid omnino diversum ab his, quae in ea expressa sunt; tertia fidelis instructionis; quia quod implicitum est explicat.

And/or it another way it must be said, that there is an addition, in which the thing added is *contrary*, and there is (one),[6] in which the thing added is *diverse*, and there is (one), in which the thing added is *consonant*. The first addition belongs to error, the second to presumption; because it is presumption to say that (there is) in Sacred Scripture anything entirely diverse from those things, which have been expressed in it; the third (belongs) to faithful instruction; because one explicates what is implicit.

DUB. III.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Quam vincit zelus domus Dei*, quis sit iste zelus. Et quare magis hoc zelo accenditur contra *animales* et *carnales* quam contra superbos et alios peccatores? Et cum zelus sit amor privatus, non videtur quod deberet zelo accendi.

DOUBT III.

Likewise (the third doubt) is asked of this which he says: *Which zeal for the house of the Lord conquers*, what is that zeal of his? And why is he by this zeal more ignited [accenditur] against *animal* and *carnal* (men), than against the proud and other sinners? And since zeal is a private love, it does not seem that, he ought to have been ignited by zeal.

Praeterea,[7] cum maius peccatum sit superbia, videtur quod magis deberet accendi contra superbos.

Besides,[7] since pride is a greater sin, it seems that he ought to have been ignited more against the proud.

RESPONDEO: Ad primum dicendum, quod zelus est amor nolens habere consortium in amato. Zelus malus vitat omne consortium, sed zelus bonus vitat tantum malum;[8] unde veri zelatores domus Dei non possunt videre in Ecclesia vitia, quin insurgant contra ipsa. Unde Ioannis secundo dicit Glossa:[9] « Zelus bonus est, quo animus, abiecto humano timore, accenditur et eo comeditur, quo quaelibet prava, quae viderit, corrigere satagit, et si nequiverit, tolerat et gemit ».

I RESPOND: To the first it must be said, that zeal is love [amor] not wanting to have a partnership in the beloved. Evil zeal avoids all partnership, but good zeal avoids only evil (partnership);[8] whence those truly zealous [zelatores] for the house of God cannot see vices in the Church, that they do not rise up against. Whence in the second (chapter) of (St.) John, the Gloss says:[9] « Good zeal is that, by which the spirit, having cast off human fear, is ignited and by which

it is eaten up, by which it acts in a manner sufficient [satagit] to correct any depraved things, which it sees, and if it cannot, (it) tolerates (them) and groans ».

Ad secundum dicendum, quod Magister specialiter in Ecclesia zelabat fidem; et ideo magis succendebatur[10] contra fidei corruptores. Dupliciter autem corrumpit quis fidem: aut motus perversitate voluntatis et affectionis; et hic dicitur *carnalis*. Nam caro dicitur hic carnalis affectio, secundum illud ad Galatas quinto:[11] *Manifesta sunt opera carnis* etc. » Alio modo corrumpit quis, motus perversitate *iudicii*; et hic dicitur *animalis*, quasi phantasticus, quia phantasiae pervertunt iudicium rationis.

To the second it must be said, that Master (Peter) was especially zealous for faith in the Church; and for that reason he used to be enkindled[10] against corruptors of the faith. But anyone corrupts the faith in two manners: either a movement by perversity of the will and the affection; and this is called *carnal*. For carnal affection is called here "the flesh", according to that (which is said) in the fith (chapter of the Letter) to the Galatians:[11] *The works of the flesh have been manifested* etc. » In another manner one corrupts (the faith), (who is) moved by perversity of *judgment*; and here it is called *animal*, in a fanciful manner [quasi phantasticus], because fantasies [phantasiae] pervert the judgment of reason.

DUB. IV.

Quas bigas agitat in nobis Christi caritas.

CONTRA: Ecclesiastis nono:[12] *Nemo scit, utrum odio, an amore dignus sit.*

RESPONDEO: Dicendum, quod caritas uno modo dicit virtutem gratuitam, alio modo dicit large amo / rem multum appretiantem amatum.

DOUBT IV.

Which as a chariot the charity of Christ puts in motion in us.

ON THE CONTRARY: in the ninth (chapter) of Ecclesiastes:[12] *No one knows, whether he is worthy of hatred or of love*.

I RESPOND: It must be said, that charity in one manner means [dicit] "gratuitous virtue", in another manner it means broadly "the love / (that) much appreciates the beloved":

---

[1] Vat. cum recentiore cod. cc *nec est culpabilis, qui in omnibus*, quae lectio mutila exindeque vim dictis distrahens resarcitur ex antiquioribus mss. et. ed. 1.
[2] Libr. I. de Fide orthod. c. 1: Omnia, quae nobis tam per Legem et Prophetas, quam per Apostolos et Evangelistas tradita sunt, amplectimur, agnoscimus et veneramur; nec ultra ea quidquam inquriumus. — In quo textu Vat. post *ultra* omittit *haec*, quod in fere omniibus mss. et ed. 1 habetur.
[3] Vers. 18, ubi Vat. cum Vulgata contra mss. et ed. 1. *ad haec* pro *super haec*; deinde Vulgata legit *apponet Deus super illum plagas*.
[4] Faventibus antiquoribus mss. et ed. 1 nec non constructione grammaticali, substituimus *Scripturae* loco *Scripturam* quod Vat. cum recentiore cod. cc habet.
[5] Minus clare Vat. cum cod. cc legit *et* loco *per*, obnitentibus vetustioribus mss. cum ed. 1.
[6] Cod. N hic et paulo post repetit verbum *additio*.
[7] Vat. praeter fidem mss. et sex primarum edd. *Item*.
[8] Supple: consortium. — Lectio in textum recepta et praecedentibus conformior suppeditatur a mss.

---

[1] The Vatican text together with the more recent codex cc has *is not culpable, who in all his*, which reading, mutilated and hence distracting from the force of the things said, is mended from the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1.
[2] On the Orthodox Faith, Bk. I, ch. 1: All the things, which have been handed down to us as much as through the Law and Prophets, as through the Apostles and Evangelists, we embrace, acknowledge and venerate; nor do we inquire for anything beyond these. — In which passage the Vatican text omits *these things*, which are had in nearly all the manuscripts and edition 1.
[3] Verse 18, where the Vatican text together with the Vulgate, against the manuscripts and edition 1, has *to these (words)* in place of *upon these (words)*; then the Vulgate reads *God will add upon him the plagues*.
[4] With the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 favoring it, and also the grammatical structure, we have substituted *with the sense of Scripture preserved* in place of *with (its) sense preserved, . . .*

antiquioribus ac ed. 1 pro lectione Vat. et cod. cc *malos*. — Mox perturbatam, immo mendosam lectionem Vat. et paucorum codd. ut A F K cc *quae insurgunt contra ipsam*, emendavimus ope aliorum mss. et ed. 1.

[9] Glossa apud Lyranum loc. cit. v. 19 ita habet: Bonus zelus est fervor animi, quo mens, abiecto humano timore, pro defensione veritatis accenditur. Ab eo comeditur qui quaelibet prava, quae viderit, corrigere satagit; si nequit, tolerat et gemit. — Quoad primam propositionem cod. O magis quam ceteri codd. cum allegatis convenit, quia post *timore* habet *pro defensione veritatis*; quoad secundam propositionem Vat. a mss. et ed. 1 discendens legit *tendit ut* pro *comeditur quo* ac propter variatam constructionem in fine propositionis *satagat, toleret, gemat*.

[10] Vat. *Magister accendebatur*. Omnes mss. habet *succendebatur*; plures vero ut M aa bb ee *magis* pro *magister*, quam lectionem tanquam unice veram, utpote obiectioni superius positae conformem, praeferimus. Error aliorum mss. facilimus ex eo iudicatur, quod duo ista vocabula eodem fere modo abbreviantur.

[11] Vers. 18, ubi Vulgata post *sunt* addit *autem*. — Mox post *quis* supple *fidem*, quod et ed 1 habet.

[12] Vers. 1, in quo textu restituimus ex multis mss. ut A F G I K T etc. et ed. 1, ac Vulgata *utrum* loco *an*.

it makes Scripture itself, which the Vatican text together with the more recent codex cc has.

[5] Less clearly does the Vatican text, together with codex cc, read *and* in place of *by*, in opposition to the older manuscripts together with edition 1.

[6] Codex N here and a little after this repeats the word *addition* here in place of *(one)*.

[7] The Vatican text, not trusting in the manuscripts and six of the first editions, has *Likewise* instead.

[8] Supply: partnership. — The reading received here, and more conformable with the preceding things, is provided from the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, in place of the reading of the Vatican text and codex cc, which is *only evil (partnerships)*. — Next the perturbed, rather faulty reading of the Vatican text and of a few of the codices, as A F K and cc, *which rise against Her*, we have emended with the assistance of the other manuscripts and edition 1.

[9] The Gloss, quoted in Nicolas of Lyra, loc. cit., v. 19, has this: Good zeal is fervor of spirit, by which the mind, having cast off fear, is enkindled on behalf of the defense of truth. By this one is eaten up who acts in a sufficient manner to correct any depraved things, which he sees; (and) if he cannot, he tolerates (them) and groans. — In regard to the first proposition codex O more than all other codices, agrees with this reading, because after *fear* it has *on behalf of the defense of the truth*; in regard to the second proposition the Vatican text, departing from the manuscripts and edition 1, reads *one tends to* in place of *is eaten up, by this* and on account of the diverse construction has at the end of the proposition, *act in a sufficient manner, tolerate, groan*.

[10] The Vatican text has *Master (Peter) used to be set on fire*. All the manuscripts have *used to be enkindled*; but very many, as M aa bb and ee, have *more* in place of *Master (Peter)*, which reading we have preferred as the only true one, as it is conformable to the above, posited objection. The error of the other manuscripts is explained more easily from this, that those two words [magis & Magister] are abbreviated in the same manner.

[11] Verse 18, where the Vulgate adds autem after sunt [rendering the English: But the works of . . .]. — Next after *corrupts* supply *the faith*, as is had even in edition 1.

[12] Verse 1, in which we have restores from many manuscripts, as A F G I K T etc. and edition 1, and from the Vulgate, *whether* [utrum] in place of *or* [an].

---

p. 24

amor / rem multum appretiantem amatum: unde caritas,[1] *amor carus*. Primo modo sumta caritate, verum est, quod certitudinaliter nescit aliquis;[2] potest tamen aliquo experimento dulcedinis divinae misericordiae hoc coniicere probabiliter; secundo modo potest scire. Et si primo

(that) much appreciates the beloved": whence charity (is called, as it were),[1] *a dear love* [amor carus]. Having taken charity in the first manner, it is true, that one does not know with certitude [cerrtitudinaliter nescit];[2] one can, however, by some experience of the sweetness of the Divine Mercy conjecture this with probability

modo dicit Magister, non dicit asserendo, sed coniiciendo; si secundo modo, tunc assertive potest intelligi; et sic patet illud.

[probabiliter]; in the second manner one can know it [scire]. And if Master (Peter) speaks in the first manner, he does not say (it) by asserting, but by conjecture; if in the second manner, then he can be understood (to do so) in an assertive manner; and thus this is clear.

DIVISIO TEXTUS SECUNDAE PARTIS PROLOGI

Quamvis non ambigamus etc. Supra posuit Magister rationes moventes ex approbatione[3] boni; hic ponit rationes moventes ex odio et detestatione mali; et hoc est malus haereticae perversitatis. Habet autem haec pars quatuor particulas. In *prima* parte tangit eorum perversitatem, quae consistit in calumniando bonum et verum ex erroris caecitate et invidiae pari malignitate.[4] In *secunda* tangit huius perversitatis radicem, quae est suggestio diabolica et propria superbia, ibi: *Quam Deus huius saeculi*. In tertia tangit huius erroris diffusionem,[5] quae est per falsam superstitionem et mendacem et contentiosam locutionem, ibi: *Habent rationem sapientiae in superstitione*. In quarta infert rationem, quae ipsum movit ad praesentis operis compilationem, ibi: *Horum igitur Deo odibilem*. Et ratio haec est subversio erroris.

THE DIVISION OF THE TEXT OF THE SECOND PART OF THE PROLOGUE

Although we do not dispute etc. Above Master (Peter) posited the reasons moving from approbation of[3] the good; here he posits the reasons moving from hatred and detestation of evil; and this is the evil of heretical perversity. Moreover this part has four subparts. In the *first* part he touches upon their perversity, which consists in calumniating the good and the true out of the blindness of error and the equal malignity of envy.[4] In the *second* he touches upon the root of this perversity, which is a diabolic suggestion and one's own pride, there (where he says): *Which the god of this age*. In the third he touches upon the diffusion of this error,[5] which is through false superstition and mendacious and contentious speech, there (where he says): *They have a reason for (their) wisdom in superstition*. In the fourth he infers the reason, which moves him to the compilation of the present work, there (where he says): *Therefore lest they be able*. And this reason is the subversion of error.

DUBIA CIRCA LITTERAM SECUNDAE PARTIS PROLOGI.

Dub. V.

Quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Veritati non intellectae*. Videtur enim,[6] quod dicat male, quia veritas est lux intelligibis, sicut lux corporalis sensibilis; sed oculus habens visum non potest ignorare lucem sensibilem: ergo pari ratione nec intellectus ignorabit lucem intelligibilem. *Si tu dicas*, quod non est simile; quaeritur, quare non est simile, et quare magis deficit natura intellectui quam sensui?

DOUBTS CONCERNING THE TEXT OF THE SECOND PART OF THE PROLOGUE

Doubt V.

(The fifth doubt) is asked of this which he says: *the truth (that is) not understood*. For[6] it seems, that he speaks badly, because truth is intelligible light, just as corporal light (is) sensible; but the eye having sight cannot ignore the sensible light: therefore, for an equal reason, neither will the intellect be ignorant of the intelligible light. *If you say*, that it is not similar; there is asked, why it is not similar, and why does nature fail in understanding more than (it does) in sense?

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod simile est, si quis attendat. Triplex enim est causa, quare aliquis non videt visibile: aut enim non videt, quia non *vult* respicere, aut si vult, impeditur propter *defectum organi*, aut propter *absentiam lucis*. Hoc manifestum est. Similiter in spiritualibus intellectus[7] frequenter aliqua non intelligit, quia non *vult* considerare; aliquando vero non intelligit propter *impedimentum* ex parte corporis, ut patet in phreneticis et stultis; aliquando propter *abstinentiam lucis*. Licet enim lux increata se non subtrahat quantum ad *essentiam* vel quantum ad qualemcumque influentiam, subtraxit[8] tamen se homini, cum peccavit, quantum ad influentiam *perfectam*; unde dicitur inflixisse ei ignorantiam. Unde sicut oculus in tenebris errat, sic hodie miser humanus intellectus. Cum autem plene restituetur[9] in lucem, sicut oculus videre poterit omne visibile, sic intellectus omne intelligibile.

I respond: It must be said, that it is similar, if one attends. For threefold is the cause, whereby someone does not see the visible: for he either does not see, because *he does not want* to look upon it [respicere], or if he wants to, he is impeded on account of a *defect of the organ*, or on account of an *absence of light*. This is manifest. Similarly in spiritual things the intellect[7] frequently does not understand some things, because *it does not want* to consider (them); but sometimes it does not understand on account of an *impediment* on the part of the body, as is clear in the mad and the stupid; sometimes on account of an *absence of light*. For though uncreated light does not withdraw itself as much as regards (its) *essence* and/or as much as regards whatever kind of influence, it has withdrawn,[8] however, itself from a man, when he sins, as much as regards (its) *perfect* influence; whence it is said to have inflicted ignorance upon him. Wherefore as the eye errs in darkness, so today (does) the wretched human intellect. But when it[9] is fully restored to the light, just as the eye can see every visible thing, so the intellect every intelligible thing.

Dub. VI.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Veritati offendenti*. Contra: « Omnes homines natura scire desiderant »,[10] sicut etiam esse beati; sed beatitudo neminem offendit, quia omnes eam desiderant: ergo nec veritas offendit aliquem.

Doubt VI.

Likewise (the sixth doubt) is asked of this which he says: *the truth offending*. On the contrary: « All men by nature desire to know »,[10] just as (they) also (desire) to be blessed; but beatitude offends no one, because all desire it: therefore neither does truth offend anyone.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod est loqui de veritate quantum ad primum effectum, qui est *illuminare*; et quantum ad istum nemo ipsam odit: omnes enim naturaliter desiderant illuminari. Est iterum loqui quantum ad effectum consequentem, qui est *arguere*; et hunc habet in malis. Manifestando enim mala redarguit mala facientem;[11] et inde est, quod mali odiunt veritatem, quia sicut dicitur Ioannis tertio:[12] *Qui male agit, odit lucem*.

I respond: It must be said, that there is a speaking of the truth as much as regards (its) first effect, which is *to illuminate*; and as much as regards that no one hates it: for all naturally desire to be illuminated. Again there is a speaking (of it) as much as regards (its) consequent effect, which is *expressing* [arguere]; and one has this in evils. For by manifesting evils one refutes [redarguit] the doer of evils;[11] and hence it is, that evil (men) hate the truth, because as is said in the third (chapter of the Gospel) of (St.) John:[12] *He who acts in an evil manner [male], hates the light*.

Dub. VII.

Qui contentioni studentes contra veritatem sine foedere bellant. Contra: Tertii Esdrae

Doubt VII.

Who as students of contention war without the restraint of treaties against the truth.

quarto:[13] *Magna est veritas et fortior omnibus. Omnis terra veritatem invocat, et omnes tremunt eam*.

On the contrary: in the fourth (chapter) of the Third (Book) of Esdra:[13] *Great is truth and stronger than all. Every land invokes the truth, and all tremble before it*.

---

[1] Vat. hic addit *dicitur quasi*, sed castigatur ex mss. et ed. 1.
[2] Reluctantibus mss. et ed. 1, verbis ita transpositis *verum est certitudinaliter, quod nescit aliquis*, Vat. sensum Doctoris distorquet. Cod. cc omittit *quod*. Mox post *tamen* ed 1 satis bene addit praepositionem *ex*, et cod. M habet *aliquis* pro *aliquo*. S. Doctor sententiam, quam hic proponit, fusius exponit infra d. 18, p. I. a. 1. q. 2 et Comment. in Ioan. c. 14. n. 999 (Supplem. Bonelli, tom. I.).
[3] Ed. 1 *appetitione*.
[4] Codd. diversimode hic legunt; cod. V omittit *caecitate*; cod. S cum ed. 1 omittit *pari*; cod. O habet *prava* loco *pari*; alii aliter, sed corrupte; nihil immutandum duximus.
[5] Prave et contra codd. ac ed. 1 legit Vat. *defensionem*.
[6] Adiecimus ex mss. et ed. 1 *enim*.
[7] Cod. T adiungit hic *enim*, mutata in praecedentibus interpunctione; omisso siquidem puncto post *est* habet *hoc manifestum est similiter in spiritualibus*; eandem interpunctionem et plures alii codd. exhibent; sed non ita bene.
[8] Plures codd. ut F G H K Y Z et edd. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 minus bene *subtrahit*, quorum tamen aliqui sibi non constantes mox habent *peccavit*. — De influentia lucis increatae vide infra d. 3. p. I. q. 1. Scholion.
[9] Cod. N hic addit *intellectus*. Circa finem propositionis Vat. *intelliget* pro *intellectus*, contradicentibus permultis mss. et ed. 1.
[10] Aristot., I. Metpah. text. 1.
[11] Corruptam lectionem Vat. *manifestatio enim mali redarguit facientem* emendavimus ex mss. et ed. 1.
[12] Verse. 20.
[13] Verse 35 et 36, ubi Vulgata: Et veritas magna et fortior *prae* omnibus etc.

[1] The Vatican text here adds *is called, as it were* [Trans. without the comma], but this is corrected from the manuscripts and edition 1 [Trans., which however the trans. follows for greater clarity.]
[2] Opposing the manuscripts and edition 1, by having transposed the words in this manner: *it is certainly true, that no one knows*, the Vatican text distorts the sense of the Seraphic Doctor. Codex cc omits *that*. Next after *however* edition 1 adds well enough the preposition *from* [ex, which thus renders the English, *from some*], and codex M has *someone* instead of *some* [rendering the English: *someone can, however, by experience*]. The Seraphic Doctor expounds the sentence, which is proposed here, more fully below in d. 18, p. I, a. 1, q. 2 and in his Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, ch. 14, n. 999 (Bonelli's Supplement, tom. I).
[3] Edition 1 has *an appetite for*.
[4] The codices here read in diverse manners; codex V omits *blindness* [rendering the English: *out of the equal malignity of error and envy*. The semicolon immediately following these present words is restored by the trans. in both the Latin and English texts.]; codex S together with edition 1 omits *equal*; codex O has *a depraved* in place of *an equal*; others in other ways, but corrupted; we have decided to change nothing.
[5] Wrongly and against the codices and edition 1, the Vatican text reads *the defense of error*.
[6] We have inserted *for* from the manuscripts and edition 1.
[7] Codex T inserts *for* [enim] here, having moved the period; even if the period is moved, one has *This is manifest similarly in spiritual things. For the intellect . . .*; this same punctuation very many of the other codices also exhibit; but not so well.
[8] Very many of the codices, as F G H K Y Z and editions 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, have less well *it withdraws*, some of which, however, contradicting themselves, have next *he has sinned*.
[9] Codex N has *the intellect*. Near the end of the proposition, the Vatican text has *it will understand* in place of *the intellect*, in contradiction to very many manuscripts and edition 1.
[10] Aristotle, Metaphysics, Bk. I, text 1.
[11] The corrupted reading of the Vatican text, *for the manifestation of evil refutes evil*, we have emended from the manuscripts and edition 1.
[12] Verse 20.
[13] Verses 35 and 36, where the Vulgate reads: And the truth, great and stronger *than* [prae] all etc..

---

p. 25

R**ESPONDEO:** Dicendum, quod[1] est loqui de veritate *simpliciter*, vel de veritate *in hoc*

RESPOND: It must be said, that[1] there is a speaking of the truth *in a simple manner*,

sive in speciali. *Primo modo* veritas est inexpugnabilis, et ideo praevalet; et sic intelligitur illud Esdrae. Est iterum loqui de veritate *secundo modo*; et[2] sic contingit eam per rationes phantasticas obumbrari et per contentionem impugnari. Unde Ambrosius super primum ad Romanos:[3] «Contentio est impugnatio veritatis cum confidentia clamoris ».

and/or of the truth *in this regard* or in a special way. *In the first manner* the truth is inexpugnable, and for that reason it prevails; and thus is understood that (verse) of Esdra. Again there is a speaking of the truth *in the second manner*; and[2] so it happens that it is overshadowed through fantastic reasons and impugned through contention. Whence (St.) Ambrose (says) on the First (Letter) to the Romans:[3] « Contention is an impugning of the truth with the confidence of clamor ».

Dub. VIII.

Ex *testimoniis veritatis in aeternum fundatis*. Contra: primae ad Corinthios decimo tertio:[4] *Scientia destruetur*: ergo et testimonia.

Respondeo: Quod testimonia veritatis sunt in aeternum fundata, sicut dicitur in Psalmo:[5] *Initio cognovi de testimoniis tuis* etc. Quod obiicitur, quod scientia destruetur; dicendum, quod verum est quantum ad modum docendi et considerandi, sed non quantum ad cognitum et rationem cognoscendi, Psalmus:[6] *In aeternum Domine permanet verbum tuum* etc.

Doubt VIII.

F*rom the testimonies of the truth founded in eternity*. On the contrary: in the thirteenth (chapter) of the First (Letter) to the Corinthians:[4] *knowledge shall be destroyed*: therefore also testimonies.

I **respond:** That the testimonies of truth have been founded in eternity [in aeternum], as is said in the Psalm:[5] *From the beginning I have known* [cognovi] *of Thy testimonies* etc.. Because it is objected, that knowledge [scientia] will be destroyed; it must be said, that it is true as much as regards the manner of teaching and considering, but not as much as regards the thing cognized and the reason for cognizing, as the Psalm (says):[6] *For ever, Lord, does Thy word remain* etc..

DIVISIO TEXTUS ULTIMAE PARTIS

In quo maiorum exempla. Haec est pars ultima, in qua ponit Magister rationes moventes discipulos ad audiendum. Et dividitur haec pars in quatuor partes secundum quatuor, quae movent discipulos ad audiendum, duo quorum[7] sunt ex parte operis, videlicet auctoritas et utilitas; duo vero ex parte docentis, scilicet humilitas et facilitas. In primo praeparat docilitatem, scilicet in *auctoritate*. In secundo, scilicet[8] in *utilitate*, suscitat attentionem. In duobus autem sequentibus, scilicet *humilitate et facilitate*, captat benevolentiam.

In prima igitur parte ostendit, opus suum esse authenticum, in secunda compendiosum, ibi: *Non igitur debet hic labor*; in tertia ostendit, modum docendi esse humilem, in hoc quod vult corrigi, ibi:

THE DIVISION OF THE TEXT OF THE LAST PART

In which you shall find again. This is the last part, in which Master (Peter) posits the reasons moving (his) disciples to listen. And this part is divided into four parts according to the four things, which move disciples to listen, two of which[7] are from the part of the work, namely authority and utility; but two on the part of the one teaching, that is, humility and facility. In the first (manner) he prepares (their) docility, that is in *authority*. In the second, that is[8] in *utility*, he stirs up (their) attention. But in the following two, that is with *humility and facility*, he captures (their) benevolence.

In the first part, therefore, he shows, that his work is authentic, in the second (that it is) compendious, there (where he says): *Therefore this labor ought not*; in the third he shows, that (his) manner of teaching is

In hoc autem tractatu etc. In quarta ostendit, esse facilem ad inveniendum et memorandum, ibi: *Ut autem quod quaeritur facilius occurrat*.

humble, in this that he wants to be corrected, there (where he says): *But in this tract* etc.. In the fourth he shows, that it is easy for to find and remember, there (where he says): *Moreover so that what is sought may more easily come to meet*.

DUBIUM ULTIMAE PARTIS.

Dub. IX.

Quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Liberum correctorem*; quid vult dicere per hoc nomen *liberum*?

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod liber corrector dicitur, sicut homo liber, qui « sui tantum causa est », ut dicit Philosophus;[9] sic corrector liber dicitur qui tantum gratia correctionis, non invidiae vel subsanationis corrigit. Hunc desiderat Magister exemplo Augustini secundo de Trinitate,[10] ubi dicit: «Magis amabo inspici a rectis, quam timebo morderi a perversis. Gratanter enim suscipit osculum columbinum pulcherrima et modestissima caritas; dentem vero caninum vel evitat cautissima humilitatis, vel retundit solidissima veritas: magisque optabo a quolibet reprephendi, quam sive ab errante sive ab adulante laudari ».

A DOUBT ON THE LAST PART

Doubt IX.

(The ninth doubt) is asked of this which he says: *a free corrector*; what does he want to say by this name *free*?

I respond: It must be said, that one is called a free corrector, as a free man, who « is only for his own cause », as the Philosopher says;[9] so one is called a free corrector who corrects only for the sake of correcting, not (for the sake) of envy and/or of the appearance of a cure [subsanationis]. This (kind of corrector) Master (Peter) desires after the example of (St.) Augustine in the second (book) of On the Trinity,[10] where he says: « I shall love to be inspected by the upright more than I will fear to be bitten by the perverse. For thankfully [gratanter] does most beautiful and most modest charity take up a dove's kiss; but a dog's tooth does most cautious humility avoid and/or most solid truth hammers down: and I will choose to be reprehended by anyone rather than to be praised either by the errant or the flatterer ».

---

[1] In Vat. deest *quod*, sed contra mss. et ed. 1. Mox ex mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *in hoc* loco *quantum ad hoc*, quia *in hoc* et materiae subiectae et verbis immediate subnexis magis correspondet et in operibus S. Doctoris saepius occurit.
[2] Fere ominibus mss. et ed. 1 faventibus addidimus *et*.
[3] Vers. 29. — Expositio, quae a S. Doctore et etiam a S. Thoma (hic in expos. textus) attribuitur S. Ambrosio, invenitur in Glossa ordinaria apud Lyranum. — Vat. contra codd. antiquiores specialem citationem omittendo ponit *super illud verbum Apostoli: Contentione, dicit*.
[4] Vers. 8. — Mox codd. X et Z post *respondeo* addunt *dicendum*.
[5] Psalm. 118, 152.
[6] Plsam. 118, 89. — Cod Y *Unde Psalmista* loco *Psalmus*. Paulo ante permulti codd. *et* pro *sed*, at minus bene.
[7] Postulantibus mss. et ed. 1, mutavimus *quae* in *quorum*.
[8] Vat. *In prima* et *in secunda*; quam lectionem subnexis minus cohaerentem emendamus ope fere omnium mss. et ed. 1.

[1] In the Vatican text *that* is lacking, but contrary to the manuscripts and edition 1 we have substituted *in this regard* [in hoc], because *in this regard* corresponds more to the subject matter and the words immediately subjoined and occurs more frequently in the works of the Seraphic Doctor.
[2] With nearly all the manuscripts and edition 1 favoring, we have added *and*.
[3] Verse 29. — The exposition, which by the Seraphic Doctor and even by St. Thomas (here in the exposition of the text) is attributed to St. Ambrose, is found in the Glossa ordinaria of Nicholas of Lyra. — The Vatican text, against the more ancient codices, by omitting the special citation puts it this way: *Ambrose on that word of the Apostle: By Contention, says:* .
[4] Verse 8. — Next codices X and Z add *it must be said* after *I respond:*.
[5] Psalm 118:152.
[6] Psalm 118:89. — Codex Y has *Whence the Psalmist* in place of *as the Psalm*. A little before this very many of the codices have *and* in place of *but*, though less well.
[7] As demanded by the manuscripts and edition 1, we

[9] Libr. I. Metaph. c. 3, ubi in antiqua ed. Venetiis 1489 sic legitur: Sed ut dicimus homo liber, qui suimet et non alterius causa est. — In ed. Paris. c. 2: Sed quemadmodum dicimus liber homo de eo, qui ipsius et non alterius gratia est.
[10] In Prooemio. — In hoc textu Vat., contradicentibus antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 necnon ed. operum S. Augustini, habet *castissima* pro *modestissima* et paulo infra post *caninum* omittit *vel*. Mss. in eo tantum ab ed. operum S. Augustini discedunt, quod legant *osculum* loco *oculum*, et paulo infra post *dentem* habeant *vero* pro *autem*. Sequimur mss. — Paulo supra nullius cod. auctoritate nec non contra edd. 1, 2, 3, 6 omisso *Magister* Vat. loco *Augustini* ponit *Augustinus*.

have changed *which* into *of which*.
[8] The Vatican text has *In the first (part)* and *In the second (part)*; which reading, being less coherent with what is subjoined, we emend with the assistance of nearly all the manuscripts and edition 1.
[9] Metaphysics, Bk. I, ch. 3, where in the ancient edition printed at Venice in 1489, there is read: But as we call a man free, who is for his very own cause and not another's. — In the Parisian edition, ch. 2: But according to the manner in which we call a man free from this, who is for the sake of himself and not another.
[10] In the Foreword. — In this passage the Vatican text, contradicted by the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 and even the edition of the Works of St. Augustine, has *most chaste* in place of *most modest* and a little below this, after caninum, it omits *vel* [which does not alter the translation]. The manuscripts depart from the edition of the Works of St. Augustine only in this, that they read *kiss* in place of *eye*, and a little below this, before *a dog's*, they have *but* [vero] in place of *but* [autem]. We have followed the manuscripts. — A little above this, on the authority of none of the codices and also contrary to editions 1, 2, 3 and 6, having omitted *Master (Peter)* and *of (St.) Augustine*, has *(St.) Augustine desires*.

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quarrachi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation that that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator.